MARXISM-LENINISM
VS.
MAOISM

BISWAJIT BASU

MARXISM-LENINISM

VERSUS

MAOISM

Dialectical Materialism vs Metaphysical Idealism

By

BISWAJIT BASU

MARXIST LENINIST RESEARCH CENTRE

Kolkata

Marxism-Leninism vs. Maoism
by Biswajit Basu

Edited & Translated
by Chittaranjan Das

First Bengali Publication : January 2013
English Edition : April 2018

Publisher : Utpal Basu
10, Netaji Subhas Road,
Kolkata-700 148

E-mail : mail2mlrc@gmail.com

Printer : Nandonik
Garfa, Jadavpur
Kolkata-700 078

Price : 80/-

IN LIEU OF INTRODUCTION

The moribund capitalism has become more moribund in the present world situation. Side by side, no socialist country does now exist in the world. The workers, peasants and other toiling people are stricken with exploitation and oppression. The communist and revolutionary camp has been disintegrated with the blow of crisis, the reflection of which are the theoretical confusion, vacillation, despondency and unreliability. Under these circumstances, we should earnestly recall the advices of our international teachers Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao to face the situation.

We should not forget that the communist camp did repeatedly witness this type of crisis in the past. The basis of the theoretical confusion was the mutually opposite political concept on imperialism which emerged from the differences of economic features of the era of free competition of capitalism and those of the era of imperialism. For this reason the leading Comrades should deeply study the political economy, including Stalin's last great contribution *The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* and his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) which was, as described by Mao, "a precious last testament bequeathed to the Communists of all countries of the world". In addition to it, we should study, in the field of philosophy, Lenin's *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism*, *The Materialist Conception of History* and *Materialism & Emperio-Criticism*, Stalin's *Dialectical & Historical Materialism* and Mao Tse-tung's *On Contradiction.* The leading Comrades must study the philosophical articles on materialism by Marx and Engels, including Marx's *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy,* and Engel's *Ludwig Feuerbach & the End of Classical German Philosophy*, *Anti-Duhring, Historical Materialism & Scientific Socialism* and so on.

To handle the present debate skilfully we should not restrict ourselves just in the local political activities. Those who are engaged in

the practical works of revolution have to work hard for combining their practice with theory. It should not be forgotten that the reactionaries as well as revisionists and opportunists of different hues would create confusion in different ways. We have no alternative for elevating our theoretical level so that we can face them and confidently carry on our duty overcoming vacillation, despondency and unreliability.

Today Leninism has again come at the centre of debate. Mao said, "*The Foundation of Leninis m, The History of The Bolshevik Party* and *The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* constitute an encyclopedia of Marxism-Leninism, a great synthesis of the experience of the world communist movement of the past hundred years." For this reason we should strictly abide by Mao's call: **"Long Live Leninism."**

Now I would like to draw your attention to another important subject. After the WWII Stalin and Mao took initiative to reorganise the already defunct communist camp and launch rectification movement in order to free the Communist Parties of different countries of the world from the line preached by Kautsky, Trotsky and Tito in opposition to Marxism-Leninism and Communist Internationalism. As a result, an important Editorial and a self-critical report of B T Ranadive, the then General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, were published in the organ of the Cominform in 1950. In the same year, *People's Daily*, the organ of the Communist Party of China, also published a *Letter to the Editor*. Besides, in 1952, an exclusive and deep self-criticism on some mistakes and deviations in the Party works was presented in the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU(B). In this regard, another significant incident is that, in 1948, an article of Mao was published in the 21st issue of the organ of Cominform, where Mao called: **'Revolutionary Forces of the World Unite, Fight against Imperialist Aggression.'**

I hope all these articles would profoundly help our Comrades to find out the Marxist-Leninist line and remove despondency, vacillation and unreliability, eliminating the smog of lies and calumnies propagated by the revisionists. And just it is what was the joint struggle launched by Stalin and Mao Tse-tung against revisionism. In the post-Mao period, the Chinese revisionists said in their *Resolution on the Thirty Years' History of the Party,* "Mao began to commit serious mistakes after 1950."

I appeal you to study these articles of 1950 and take them as our guideline in the revolutionary struggle in our country. I earnestly request my readers to study my Book ***Marxism-Leninism versus Maoism*** in this angel of view and send me your criticism and suggestion on it as early as possible.

I pay heartfelt greetings to my friends who helped me in various ways to author the Book and also to the MLRC that bears the responsibility for its publication.

Kolkata, January 7, 2013 **Biswajit Basu**

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Presentation	7
2.	Relationship between Era and Ideology	9
3.	In Response to Com. Shahjahan Sarker's Allegations	16
4.	Wrong Concept on the Origin of Marxism and Leninism	17
5.	Mao on the Determination of the Stages of Social Development and the Origin of Imperialism	19
6.	On the Fallacy of Independent Entity of Ideology	21
7.	On the Question of Emergence of a New Era and a New Ideology within the Same Era	22
8.	Emergence of Maoism from Leninism —an Anti-Marxist Proposition	24
9.	On the Uninterrupted Development of Capitalism	25
10.	Whether the Era of Imperialism and Leninism are Static Like the 'Heaven'	28
11.	Marxism-Leninism—the Last Phase of Development of the Ideology of Social Revolution	31
12.	Class-Independence of Philosophy and Science —an Idealist Doctrine	32
13.	On Mao Tse-tung Thought	36
	(a) On the Universality and Particularity of Contradiction	
	(b) On the Absoluteness and Relativity of Contradiction	45
	(c) On Analysis and Synthesis	45
14.	On the CPC and Maoism	48
15.	Marxism-Leninism versus Maoism	51

PRESENTATION

Today the world witnesses no socialist country, while the capitalist-imperialist system is also immerged in a deep crisis leading to an absolute disorder throughout the world.

It is known to all that the more the crisis of capitalism gets intensified the more the capitalists are trying to lighten it by imposing the burden on the working class and toiling people. At the same time, the aspirations of the people for liberation from exploitation and oppression would get intensified along with the intensification and expansion of the peoples' resistance. The recent "Occupy the Wall Street, Destroy the Capitalism" movement and the vehement resistant struggle of the people of the Arab world are the manifestation of this reality. As the capitalism has totally failed to address the social problems, the people are searching for an alternative path. Which path would they like to take after destroying capitalism? Indeed, it is socialism, the higher stage of social system, which would be their alternative path. Socialism and socialism alone can maintain harmony and stability in the society by properly addressing the social problems. In future, the people would, therefore, turn up to socialism, as, according to the law of social development, collapse of capitalism is inevitable.

In such a world situation, all reactionary forces are utilising the revisionism and left-wing opportunism for their own interest, endeavouring to re-establish idealism, destroying the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism which is the philosophical basis of socialism and communism.

Under these circumstances, Comrade Shahjahan Sarker has published a book, namely *Maobad bonam Aadhunik Samshodhonbad (Maoism versus Modern Revisionism),* from Dhaka, Bangladesh in 2012. The book came in our hand from the Kolkata Book Fair, 2012. After going through the book, we got astounded by its essence. From its *Introduction* we came to know that the book had been written in response

to an article *Mao bonam Maobaad* (*Mao versus Maoism*) of Santanu De, a prominent journalist and columnist of **Dainik Ganasakti,** the Bengali organ of CPI(M). The book deserves appreciation because in it Shahjahan Sarker condemned and tried to refute the right-wing revisionist campaign Santanu De unleashed in his article on the movements organised by the Maoists in India. But, in doing so, Sarker has imported idealism in place of materialism, metaphysics in place of dialectics and Maoism in place of Leninism, and ultimately adopted the path of negating Marxism-Leninism. Loudly uttering 'Maoism', deceiving the people by flashing in the name of armed struggle and pretending to be revolutionary to cover up their own revisionist character are, as we know, the specificity of this type of persons. Side by side, with the propaganda of idealist view in place of materialist world outlook, they are preaching that the colonial era of imperialism has come to an end and Leninism has been outdated, and hawking Maoism labelling it on the revisionist line in opposition to the line of Lenin, Stalin and Mao in the two-line struggle in the CPC. We have to follow the path Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung adopted to defend and develop the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism against this revisionist doctrine, i.e., Maoism.

During launching this debate we have to be careful, as the Maoist organisations have no well-determined political line. There are numerous points of disagreement among themselves on ideological and political questions. Despite a lot of debates among themselves, they are all united in fighting against the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism. Centring round the word 'Maoism' they unite, but their interpretation and analysis on Maoism lack uniformity. We have to endeavour to unite with those who, after being disillusioned, have returned or want to return to the path of Marxism-Leninism. We must differentiate between the bigoted "Maoists" and those who have been entangled with Maoists by some means or other. With this angle of view, I restrict my article only for dealing with RIM, the bigoted Maoist and its defenders like Comrade Shahjahan Sarker.

Another important point should be mentioned here. For the revolution in a semi-feudal and semi-colonial country like India, Sarker

has put forward a line totally opposite to Mao's teachings and experiences of Chinese Revolution. We vehemently oppose it and have decided to publish another book to expose this line.

Relationship between Era and Ideology

The words 'age', 'epoch' and 'era' hold different meanings. Era means the long historical period from the beginning of a social system to its end marking its replacement with a higher one, while the beginning of that system is called epoch. For instance, the epoch of imperialism means the beginning of imperialism, while the long period of imperialism from its beginning to the end marking the total collapse of world capitalist-imperialist system with the worldwide victory of socialism is called the era of imperialism.

The Comrades of the opposition insist, "The era is the stage of social development whereas our ideology is a science. Therefore, there is no relation of ideology with era." Definitely, the era is the stage of social development. But if there is no relation of ideology with era, how and wherefrom has our ideology, the ideology of social revolution, evolved? What does the era, i.e., the stage of social development mean? Following the pathway of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, our great international teachers, we have to find out the answers of all these questions.

The history of human society has been divided in some parts, and each part is marked by a stage of its development or era. The philosophers before Marx could neither devise any scientific method for determining the stages of social development nor did they give any interpretation. It is Marx who first formulated the theory of socio-economic formation to interpret these stages scientifically.

With each era having its own socio-economic formation, five stages of such socio-economic formation have been determined so far, namely, primitive community, slave-owner society, feudal system, capitalist system and communist society. Mode of production is the material and economic basis of each social formation. Economy is, however, the basis of each social formation, its backbone, and so to speak, it's skeleton while politics, philosophy, ideology, art and literature, and the political institutions constitute its superstructure. Production, economic base and superstructure are three important components of each social formation.

Obviously, each era has a definite economy with definite class ideology which is the part of superstructure.

To have a clear idea on the relation of ideology to era, we should study the laws of social development, including the laws of production, development of productive forces, relations of production and economy of the society. One aspect of the mode of production is the productive forces while the other is the relations of production. The relations of production must have to conform to and maintain a harmony with the development of productive forces. The inconformity and disharmony between these two aspects beyond a certain limit, are the economic basis of social revolution. Generally, the relations of production lag behind the productive forces, leading to a contradiction between the new productive forces and old relations of production. At the moment of crisis this contradiction gets intensified, and the relations of production stand as an obstacle to the development of the productive forces, leading to a revolt by the productive forces against the existing mode of production. With the creation of new relations of production replacing the old ones through social revolution, productive forces rapidly develop. There is hardly any exception of this law of social changes in all class-divided societies.

The sum total of the relations of production constitutes the economic structure, the real foundation, on which erects the legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of material life of family and society.

The history shows that the development of a society is accomplished according to certain laws, as a historical motion. As a result, the practice of social development has received the status of science. Social science, therefore, hardly bears with any arbitrariness and whimsicality in thoughts and deeds.

The pre-Marxist philosophical doctrines explained the being with thinking. But, as Marx showed, social consciousness is the reflection of the objective life condition, i.e., economy of the society. Contrary to the pre-Marxist philosophy, Marx devised the scientific method for explaining the social consciousness with social existence, and in this way was established the conformity of objective basis of society with social science.

As the Comrades of the opposition insist that there is no relation of ideology to era, the question arises whether the social consciousness reflects social existence or just the reverse— social existence reflects the social consciousness. Engels observed, "The question of the relation of thinking to being, the relation of spirit to nature is the paramount question of the whole of philosophy."[1] Those who assert the primacy of nature and being comprise the materialist camp while those who give priority to spirit and thinking are under the camp of idealism. Now let us judge which camp the protagonists of this new ideology belong to. In this regard, Stalin said, "If nature, being, the material world, is primary, and consciousness, thought, is secondary, derivative; if the material world represents objective reality existing independently of the consciousness of men, while consciousness is a reflection of this objective reality; it follows that material life of society, its being, is also primary, and its spiritual life secondary, derivative, and that the material life of society is an objective reality existing independently of the will of men, while the spiritual life of society is a reflection of this reality, a reflection of being."[2] Contrary to Marx and Engels, the protagonists of the new-ideology are following the idealistic line of interpreting being with thinking.

From this analysis it is clear that the origins of spiritual life formation, social consciousness and views, political ideology and political institutions are to be sought in the material life of society, its being.

Regarding different social ideas in different periods of history, Stalin further observed, "If in different periods of the history of society different social ideas, theories, views and political institutions are to be observed; if under the slave system we encounter certain social ideas, theories, views and political institutions, under feudalism others, under capitalism other still, this is not to be explained by the "nature", the "properties" of the ideas, theories, views and political institutions themselves but by the different conditions of the material life of society at different periods of social development. Whatever is the being of a society, whatever are the conditions of material life of a society, such are the ideas, theories, political views and political institutions of that society,"[3] The social being and material life of society are, therefore, the basis of origin of social ideas, ideology.

Here it is clearly revealed that the social ideas and ideology undergo changes as a result of the change in the conditions of the material life of

society. Ideology is, therefore, inseparably related to era. Those who propagate that there is no relation of ideology to era are trying to bring back the pre-Marxist bourgeois idealist philosophy with a view to abandoning Marxist-Leninist philosophical materialism.

The social scientists before Marx projected only the ideological motives in the historical activities of human beings, without investigating the origins of those motives. Marx, however, revealed that, without exception, all ideas and all the various tendencies *stem* from the condition of the material forces of production, and thereby indicated the way to an all-embracing and comprehensive study of the process of the origin, development and decline of socio-economic systems. Lenin showed the three sources and three component parts of Marxism— philosophy, political economy and socialism. From the estuary of the combination of these three streams, Marx expounded an integral and harmonious scientific doctrine for social revolution, i.e., Marxism. Acknowledging Marx's extraordinary contribution, Lenin said, "Marx deepened and developed philosophical materialism to the full, extended the cognition of nature to include the cognition of *human society.* His *historical materialism* was a great achievement in scientific thinking. The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in views on history and politics were replaced by a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory, which shows how, in consequence of the growth of productive forces, out of one system of social life another and higher system develops— how capitalism, for instance, grows out of feudalism."[4] To interpret Marx's philosophical and historical materialism Lenin continued, "Just as man's knowledge reflects nature (i.e., developing matter), which exists independently of him, so man's *social knowledge* (i.e., his various views and doctrines — philosophical, religious, political and so forth) reflects the *economic system* of society. Political institutions are a superstructure on the economic foundation."[5]

Engels, who was Marx's close Comrade-in arms in founding Marxism and scientific socialism by launching theoretical struggle against the incompleteness, inconsistency and one-sidedness of the pre-Marxist materialism, against the utopian socialism to found scientific socialism, etc., and who was, in fact, known as the pillar of scientific world outlook, interpreted Marx's materialist conception of history: "...the ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in their growing insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange.

They are to be sought, not in the *philosophy,* but in the *economics* of each particular epoch. The growing recognition that existing social institutions are irrational and unjust, that reason has become unreason, kindness a scourge, is only a sign that changes in the modes of production and exchange have silently been taking place with which the social order adapted to earlier economic conditions is no longer in keeping."[6]

Why are the existing social and political institutions suddenly recognised to be irrational and unjust? This question brings us from the world of views and ideas to the world of conditions of our objective life. With the change in the objective and economic life through the development of the mode of production, men start to search out new paths. From this viewpoint it is clear that the basis of inception of a revolutionary ideology lies in the mode of production and economic condition of a particular epoch.

Ideology, as Stalin observed, does not drop from the sky, it evolves from the mode of production and economic conditions of the society, as the economic conditions change first and the consciousness of men undergoes a corresponding change later. In the struggle against the pre-Marxist philosophers who propagated utopian socialism and proclaimed independent entity of ideology, Stalin insisted, "Only that ideal is good and acceptable which is based on a study of economic conditions. All those ideals which ignore economic conditions and are not based upon their development are useless and unacceptable."[7]

We have dealt with how and wherefrom the social ideas, theories, views and political institutions evolve. After evolving they influence the social life, development of the conditions of material life of society. Stalin said, "As regards the significance of social ideas, theories, views and political institutions, as regards their role in history, historical materialism, far from denying them, stresses the important role and significance of these factors in the life of society, in its history."[8]

Now, let us come to a significant question on it. The essence of the doctrine that "there is no relation of ideology to era", which the Comrades of the opposition preach, is to proclaim the independent entity of ideology alienating it from society. To alienate ideology from society means alienating it from economy. Lenin showed three sources and three component parts of Marxism—philosophy, political economy and socialism. If economy is deduced, an important component of Marxism will be severed. Is it, therefore, rational to claim such ideology as the continuity of Marxism? Certainly not.

The economic system of society, as Lenin observed, reflects the social knowledge of mankind (i.e., various philosophical, religious, political views and doctrines) while the political institutions constitute superstructure of the economic base. If economic aspect is deduced or ignored, wherefrom does the social knowledge come? Would it drop from the sky? Would it not be ridiculous to accept such an ideology barring social knowledge as the ideology of social revolution?

Classes, class contradiction, class conflict and class struggle originate from the mutually opposite economic interests in society. To alienate ideology from the economy means to decline the class-character of ideology, to accept a class-independent bourgeois ideology, and over and above this, to support the doctrine of class collaboration in place of class struggle, isn't it?

By severing the relation of ideology to era the protagonists of Maoism are opposing the materialist theory on the relationship between the two, proclaiming independent entity of ideology, thereby declining its class character. Uttering high-sounding phrases like "ism of era versus ideology", "ideology and dialectics", etc., they are trying to preach such an idea that one may take dialectics alone as the Marxist philosophy. They alienate dialectics from materialism, and thereby decline the Marxist philosophy of dialectical materialism, and at the same time, throw the words 'dialectical materialism' off and on to confuse and deceive the young generation. Marxist philosophy is materialism. Stalin said, "Dialectical materialism is the world outlook of the Marxist-Leninist party. It is called dialectical materialism because its approach to the phenomena of nature, its method of studying and apprehending them, is *dialectical,* while its interpretation of the phenomena of nature, its conception of these phenomena, its theory, is materialistic." "Historical materialism is," as Stalin continued, "the extension of the principles of dialectical materialism to the study of social life, an application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the phenomena of the life of society, to the study of society and of its history."[9] Obviously, the protagonists of Maoism decline this theory of historical materialism.

Hegel was, as we know, a philosopher who formulated the main features of dialectics, but his philosophy was idealistic. Engels commented, "Hegel was an idealist. To him the thoughts within his brain were not the more or less abstract images of actual things and processes,

but on the contrary, things and their evolution were only the realised images of the "Idea", existing somewhere from eternity before the world was. This way of thinking turned everything upside down, and completely reversed the actual connection of things in the world."[10]

Our criticism on the Maoists' so-called theory on dialectics is somewhat identical to that of Engels on Hegel's idealistic outlook. We feel they are nothing but outright idealists. Regarding Hegel's dialectical system Marx said, "My dialectical method is not only different from the Hegelian but is its direct opposite. To Hegel... the process of thinking, which under the name of 'the Idea' he even transforms into an independent subject is the demiurgos (creator) of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the idea'. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought."[11] The minds of these protagonists of 'dialectics', like that of Hegel, are fully engulfed by the idealistic philosophy.

Alienated from society or being, the Hegelian dialectics failed to show the way of liberation of the working class from wage-slavery, to bring the economy out of the bourgeois periphery, and also to uplift the utopian concept on socialism to the level of scientific socialism. Acknowledging Hegel's genius, Engels asserted, "Although Hegel had grasped some individual interconnections correctly and with genius, yet..... The Hegelian system as such was a colossal miscarriage—but it also the last of this kind."[12] Marx and Engels made revolution in the field of philosophy, but these valuable tenets are being declined by the protagonists of Maoism.

As a result, the protagonists of Maoism, in different countries as well as in the International arena, are getting alienated from the genuine Marxist-Leninists, instead of enjoying their support. In the name of "ideological upliftment", "creative Maoism", etc., they are trying their best to revive the "Hegelian miscarriage" in Peru, Nepal, Bangladesh and more or less in India as well. This "miscarriage" has already dismantled revolution in Peru and Nepal, splitting the Communist Parties and alienating them from the working class and the revolutionary people. Today the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) has adopted "Prachanda Path", the new version of Khrushchevite parliamentary democracy, essentially abandoning the path of Chinese Revolution and even their mask of "Maoism".

In Response to Shahjahan Sarker's Allegations

In order to found Maoism Comrade Shahjahan Sarker has put forward some arguments, without paying heed to dialectical materialistic analysis by Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung on the process of origin, development and decline of imperialism—the new and highest stage of capitalism. Moreover, he falls upon the essence of dialectical and historical materialism, the phylosophical basis of Marxism-Leninism, from directly opposite view-point, and projects himself as a genuine Maoist by raising baseless allegations against those who are trying to refute his idealistic fallacies. The allegations are as follows [quoted from Shahjahan Sarker's Book *Maobaad bonam Aadhunik Sonshodhonbaad* (Maoism versus Modern Revisionism)] :

(i) "Santanu De's '*Yugbaad'* (ism of era) might be the greatness of some supreme offerings but can hardly be the science of dialectical materialistic philosophy. In social science, dialectics is not such a static subject that denies the emergence of a new ideology or "ism" in the same era."(vide, pg.30)

(ii) "Santanu De's deep-rooted thinking is that Marxism-Leninism is the highest phase of development of ideology of social revolution. This thinking has led to a mischievous effort of turning Marxism-Leninism into a gospel truth. This thinking is wrong and unscientific, and hardly conforming to Marxism-Leninism." (pg. 32)

(iii) "Instead of taking Leninism as the development of Marxism in the era imperialism and the continuity of Marxism, Santanu De takes Leninism as a separate ideology, and even era as an alienated entity from theory. As a result, the unfailing and everlasting development of ideology within the same era remains beyond his realisation."(pg. 34)

(iv) "Mr. De's Leninism, the Marxism of the era of imperialism, is unchangeable, absolute and holy like the heaven, which does hardly undergo any change. There is not any relation of Stalin's interpretation on Leninism to it. Those who perceive Leninism with a static world outlook of imperialist era but hardly perceive the emergence of any new feature and change within the era of

imperialism are comparable to those who think the heaven as an unchangeable entity."(pg.34)

(v) "Various forms of class struggle and new scientific formulations on the philosophical, political, economic and other aspects of contradiction manifest the development of ideologies more than one within the same era. So De's proposition that the emergence of a new 'ism' is not possible till imperialism is the last phase of capitalism is totally baseless." (pg. 35)

Com. Sarker, it is neither a matter of Santanu De alone nor a personal matter between him and you. In fact, you accuse those who oppose your doctrine on Maoism of "one-sidedly seeing the world as isolated and static with a metaphysical and evolutionist world outlook". The opponents have, however, already raised just these accusations against you. Formally targeting Santanu De, have you not thrown the counter-accusations with a view to refuting the accusations the opponents raised?

Wrong Concept on the Origin of Marxism and Leninism

Is there any relationship between the era of social system and the era of ideology? Marx observed, "No historical epoch can be judged with its consciousness, rather the consciousness of the epoch would have to be judged with the contradictions in the material life, with the conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production."[13]

Here, by the "historical epoch" Marx wanted to mean the epoch of social system while the "consciousness of the epoch" means that consciousness emerges from the epoch of social system. The social being and social thinking (ideology) are not separated from rather related to each other. But Com. Sarker cherishes just the opposite view of Marx.

Now let us theoretically as well as practically judge how much rational these allegations are.

According to the law of materialism, all things in the world are changeable, moveable and connected to one another. In this regard, Stalin said, "Dialectics tells us that nothing in the world is eternal, everything is transient and mutable; nature changes, society changes, habits and customs change, conceptions of justice change, truth itself changes—that is why dialectics regards everything critically."[14]

Those who decline that nothing in the world can remain stationary, immovable and static forever and that everything has a process of inception, development and extinction are idealists, and not materialists.

That if the era of Leninism emerges from that of Marxism "then the reason or cause of a new revolutionary ideology not emerging from Leninism does not stand a trial" is the essence of Sarker's argument on the emergence of ideology. This view brings some questions on the emergence of Marxism or any 'ism' or ideology to the surface.

If, according to Sarker, Leninism emerges from Marxism, then from what ideological era did Marxism emerge? Our great international teachers Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao taught us that Marxism emerged from the era of capitalism and Leninism from that of imperialism. It is the objective basis wherefrom an ideology emerges. Stalin defined Leninism as "Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution". Mao said, "Marxism could be the product only of capitalist society." Declining these well-known formulations, Sarker tries to teach us just the opposite to Marxism-Leninism. According to the Hegelian idealism, 'the Idea' is the demiurgos (creator) of the real world. The Machists lent 'sensation' an independent entity, against which Lenin launched an intense debate in his famous Book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.*

On the relation of thinking (consciousness) to being (matter) Lenin observed, "But the question here is not of this or that formulation of materialism but of the opposition of materialism to idealism, of the difference between the two fundamental lines of philosophy. Are we to proceed from things to sensation and thought? Or are we to proceed from thought and sensation to things? The first line, i.e., the materialist line, is adopted by Engels. The second line, i.e., the idealist line, is adopted by Mach....He kept unanswered the question of origin of sensation. This is an example of "refutation" of materialism by the idealists and their followers."[15]

In his Book, Shahjahan Sarker, the protagonist of Maoism, raised a question, of which he himself answered, "Is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism a common integrated whole or an entity separated from one another? Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is a common integrated whole and totally universal." Look here, declining consciousness (thinking) as the reflection of existence (being), Sarker has lent ideology an independent entity. It is a downright reactionary doctrine of refuting materialism with the help of idealism, and certainly an unscientific proposition of

interpreting matter with consciousness expounded by the idealist philosophers of the time before Marx and Engels. Is it not a heinous effort of protecting the interest of the exploiting classes instead of that of the proletariat?

Formally inserting the clause 'the development of the imperialist era' in the sentence "If the development of the imperialist era of Leninism is possible in the absolute era of Marxism,.....", Sarker has tried to lighten the debate. But Leninism has not emerged from Marxism nor imperialism has evolved out of Leninism. Marxism has emerged from the capitalist society while Leninism, being the ideological aspect of material condition of the society in the era of imperialism, a special stage of the development of capitalism, the features of which were analysed by Lenin, has been acknowledged as the further development of Marxism. So, Sarker has adopted an idealistic viewpoint in opposition to Marxist materialism on the interrelation between existence and social consciousness.

Mao on the Determination of the Stage of Social Development and the Origin of Imperialism

Is it possible for the capitalism to develop in more than two stages? One and all, i.e., Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, showed just two stages of the development of capitalism: the stage of free capitalist competition and the stage of monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism. Lenin said, "Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism." As capitalism reached the highest stage after passing through the stage of free competition, there wouldn't and couldn't be any third stage of development, rather would start its collapse.

The protagonists of new-era have spent several pages on interpreting the absolute era, relative era and the universality as well as particularity of contradiction from Com. Mao's ***On Contradiction.*** But they have turned a blind eye to what Mao wrote on the determination of the stage of development of capitalism and the origin of imperialism in his article. Regarding the determination of the stage of social development, Mao said, "...the fundamental contradiction becomes more and more intensified as it passes from one stage to another in the lengthy process. In addition, among the numerous major and minor contradictions which

are determined or influenced by the fundamental contradiction, some become intensified, some are temporarily or partially resolved or mitigated, and some new ones emerge; hence the process is marked by stages. If people do not pay attention to the stages in the process of development of a thing, they cannot properly deal with its contradictions."[16]

With a view to founding Maoism with the help of dialectics Com. Sarker has entered into a scholarly discussion on the universality and particularity of contradiction, but now he cannot find the way out. Com. Mao has showed that the fundamental contradiction becomes more and more intensified, some contradictions are partially resolved or mitigated and some new contradictions emerge. All these are essential conditions for determining the new stage in the process of development of the era.

To explain the development of capitalism Com. Mao said, "For instance, when the capitalism of the era of free competition developed into imperialism, there was no change in the class nature of the two classes in fundamental contradiction, namely, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, or in the capitalist essence of society; however, the contradiction between these two classes became intensified, the contradiction between monopoly and non-monopoly capital emerged, the contradiction between the colonial powers and the colonies became intensified, the contradiction among the capitalist countries resulting from their uneven development manifested itself with particular sharpness, and thus there arose the special stage of capitalism, the stage of imperialism. Leninism is the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletariat revolution precisely because Lenin and Stalin have correctly explained these contradictions and correctly formulated the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution for their resolution."[17]

Mao explained the rise of imperialism as the special stage of development of capitalism and also interpreted the new contradictions in the era of imperialism. He further mentioned that Lenin and Stalin had explained those contradictions and formulated the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution for their resolution. Did those contradictions exist in the era of free competition of capitalism? Certainly not.

For these reasons, as Mao interpreted, the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution is called Leninism. Mao further showed that Lenin had explained and analysed the new contradictions in the era of imperialism, on the basis of which Leninism emerged as the ideology of the world proletariat. Com. Sarker does, however, nurture

just the opposite view. His interpretation of Leninism "emerging from Marxism" is downright idealistic. For this reason he is, carefully shunning Mao's explanation, making turbid the water and trying his best to preach the anti-Mao proposition of Maoism by presenting a wrong and distorted interpretation of Mao's teachings on the universality and particularity of contradiction. All these reveal that Shahjahan Sarker is an outright idealist, standing against the Marxist dialectical and historical materialism. For this idealistic viewpoint all he preaches are likely to confront with materialistic world outlook.

On the Fallacy of Independent Entity of Ideology

Com. Sarker has launched a fresh debate with the word 'epoch', and tries to determine the historical period with the era of ideology instead of the era of social development. Certainly, his sense of history runs counter to the materialist conception. Does his ideology drop from the sky, alienating from society? Ideology is, as we know, a component of superstructure, undergoing change with the change of the economic base. But Com. Shahjahan Sarker is preaching the ideology of era without its material basis. It is just opposite to Lenin's teaching of taking Marxism as a harmonious and integral whole.

What is Sarker's conception on the causes of proletarian revolution? The causes of revolution are, as we know, to be sought in the *economics* of each particular epoch. Therefore, the revolutionary ideology must be related to the economics and modes of production of the epoch. The ideology which is alienated from era instead of being related to it can never deserve to be an ideology of social revolution.

Sarker deals with dialectics; but, we know, Marxist philosophy is materialism which follows some laws. Materialism is a philosophy while dialectics is the method of its analysis and interpretation. Marx formulated the theory of dialectical materialism by integrating these two to bring revolution in the philosophical field. Sarker has taken the reverse direction of Marx's by alienating dialectics from materialism.

Alienation of ideology from epoch or era, as done by Sarker & co, is a idelistic thinking of separating ideology from social science.

Sarker proclaims the era of Marxism, the era of Leninism and, certainly, the "era of Maoism". But, we know, the Marxist doctrine is monistic — a doctrine that emerged from nature or society. Society or

being has two aspects — objective and subjective—which mutually exist and mutually develop. It is, therefore, not rational to think of the era of Marxism without its material aspect, i.e., the era of capitalism, and of Leninism without the era of imperialism. There are neither continuous struggles between existence (being) and consciousness (thinking), between the era of capitalism and era of Marxism and between the era of imperialism and era of Leninism nor they negate each other. Sarker continuously speaks of the era of Marxism, era of Leninism and "era of Maoism" by separating consciousness from existence to lend consciousness an independent entity. Obviously, it is the manifestation of reviving the idealistic thinking which prcolaims 'the Idea' does create the real world. All these reveal that Sarker himself has been seriously infected with the outlook of taking nature as an accidental agglomeration of things, of phenomena, isolated from each other.

Dialectical materialism further asserts that "matter without motion is as inconceivable as motion without matter". Motion is a condition of the existence of matter. Matter is moveable and changeable. Era, i.e., social being (matter) is primary while social thinking which is subjective is mental and secondary. Era (objective aspect) changes first and ideology emerges therefrom, i.e., it is era or epoch from which ideology is created. Ideology has no independent existence, and hence no inherent motion. Its motion depends on the motion of development of epoch.

Ideology is the reflection or image of existence. Ideology itself is, therefore, not the era, but ideology of the era. Ideology undergoes changes with the change of era, e.g., Marxism is the ideology of the proletariat in the era of capitalism and Leninism is the ideology of the proletariat in the era of imperialism. When we speak of the era of Leninism we mean the ideology of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. There won't and can't be any era of ideology with independent existence.

On the Question of Emergence of New Era and New Ideology from the Same Era

Com. Sarker says, "In the field of social science, dialectics is not a static subject that declines the emergence of a new ideology or 'ism' from the same era." Dreadfully afraid of social science and the science of history, he has essentially averted them and formally mentioned the phrase "in the field of social science". Had it not been so, Marx's theory

of conforming social science with its objective basis and reorganising the old social science on this objective basis could not remain out of his sight; and, he could take the path of explaining social thinking (consciousness) with social being (existence) by applying materialism in the social life of mankind. On the contrary, he has chosen just the opposite, idealistic path. If "dialectics is", as he mentioned, "not a static subject", the question arises whether materialism is a static subject. Is it not an endeavour of separating dialectics from materialism and negating materialism with dialectics? Certainly, it is. For this reason, he is shouting of the era of Marxism, era of Leninism and era of Maoism, intentionally forgetting the era of capitalism and era of imperialism.

The development of a new theory or ideology or emergence of a new "ism" in the same era is, as Sarker alleges, being declined. Here, with the word 'era' he means the era of ideology while his opposition means the era of social development. Obviously, it is the basis of all disagreements and also the reason for taking mutually opposite positions. Now let us look into the view of his opposition on the emergence of a new ideology or "ism" in the same era.

How would be the time period of the transition from one stage to another in the development of history of the society demarked? In the materialist conception of history, this time period can be demarked by Marx's formulation on the socio-economic formation. The development of history cannot remain static within the same socio-economic formation, nor can the development from one formation to another be accomplished only through successive qualitative changes or vehement leaps. It can be accomplished from lower to higher phase within the same socio-economic formation. It means that this is the internal phase of development of capitalist formation, and should not be confused with the new phase of replacing the capitalist formation with a socialist one. In this condition, two different formations coexist. It is clear that the opposition (who opposes Sarker's view) profoundly emphasizes, far from declining, the rise (i.e., the theory of emergence, development and decline) of the era of imperialism from the era of capitalism, and the emergence and development of Leninism as the proletarian ideology of the era of imperialism. So, the reality reveals that the allegations Com. Sarker raises against his opposition are baseless, incredible and motivated.

Emergence of Maoism from Leninism — an Anti-Marxist Proposition

Whether a new ideology or 'ism' can emerge from the same era is a point of debate, no doubt. But the main debating point is, as Com. Sarker raised, that "there is no reason or justification of not developing a new revolutionary ideology (Maoism) from the era of Leninism".

We know, in a capitalist society, the ideology of the capitalist class is a bourgeois one while the newly emerging ideology of the rising proletariat is Marxism. The ideology of the proletariat in the era of imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, is Leninism. As Leninism is the further development of Marxism, the integral ideology of the proletariat in the era of imperialism is Marxism-Leninism. The international teachers of the proletariat have taught us likewise. Therefore, Com. Sarker's view on the emergence, development and decline of an ideology is likely to oppose to that of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. For this reason he has emphasized the era of ideology instead of the era of social development. Would Com. Sarker like to accept the replacement of Marxism and Leninism with the words 'capitalism' and 'imperialism', respectively, in his speeches? Certainly, he would not accept this change because he has skilfully chosen the words the 'era of Marxism' and 'era of Leninism' instead of the era of capitalism and era of imperialism with a view to returning to idealism to install Maoism.

The reason of these changes has been found out. In 1997, the representative of RIM said in a bilateral talk with the undivided MCC, "Previously, in opposition to a Lin Piaoist conception that we had entered a new era, which Mao Tse-tung Thought was equated with, we were careful to point out that there is not a new era. It remains the case that this is the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. However, we tended to confuse the notion of new era with new stage in the development of the science."

It is, however, clear from this statement that Lin Piao told of Mao Tse-tung Thought, and not Maoism. Thought and 'ism' (ideology) are not the same. Lin told of a new era which Mao Tse-tung Thought was equated with. From this speech it is evident, though not so clearly, that Lin accepted the relation of ideology to era, whereas the RIM is deadly against it. Without its objective aspect there cannot be a new era which

"Mao Tse-tung Thought is equated with". The RIM said, "...there is not a new era. ...this is the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Let it suffice to remove the confusion of the emergence of a new era." No, the confusion of the new era of social development cannot be removed with the stage of ideology, as these two are not identical. The attempt for doing so is a ridiculous gesture. Under the pretext of removing the confusion on new era, Sarker is trying his best to deceive the youth and assemble them in the camp of Maoism by creating more confusion on theory.

With an infantile gesture Com. Sarker insists, "There is no reason for a new revolutionary ideology, i.e., Maoism, not developing in the era of Leninism." He has been tirelessly endeavouring to project himself as an expert of dialectics, but after coming at this juncture he throws away dialectics to become an infant, calm and quiet, utterly forgetting that the theory of inception of a new era, new theory and new ideology follows certain norms and laws of dialectical materialism. Aren't the changes in the international situation, inception of the new stage of economy, transition from lower to higher stage, and the emergence of some new contradictions in the transitional period from capitalism to imperialism beyond his realisation or totally ignored as a consequence of his adoption of the idealistic world outlook? As a matter of fact, the main obstacle in taking the road of materialism for installing "Maoism" is Lenin's theorization of imperialism as the "highest stage"/ "last stage" of capitalism, as the third stage of the development of ideology has no objective basis. It is hardly possible to establish Maoism in this way. For this reason, Sarker turned 180° from materialism to idealism to hawk the theory of the era of ideology.

On the Uninterrupted Development of Capitalism

Com. Sarker said, "There is no ground of not emerging a new ideology, i.e., Maoism, from Leninism, if Leninism can emerge from Marxism." In order to impose this evolutionist and mechanical concept he falsely and intentionally accused his opposition of "taking the era of imperialism and Leninism as static and unchangeable like the heaven which hardly undergoes any change".

In reply to his argument I would like to centralise my discussion on two points:

First, Sarker declines Marx's analysis on the capitalist social system which is the basis of the emergence of Marxism, abandoning the law of contradiction between the productive forces and relations of production which is the general law of development of all social systems. In this way, he has joined the idealist camp by giving priority to the subjective aspect instead of the objective one in his theorization on the emergence of Leninism.

Secondly, Sarker is not conscious of two separate outlooks on the development of a matter. One outlook acknowledges only the quantitative development, and declines the significance of imperialism as the new stage of the development of capitalism. This outlook cannot explain the inception of the new and abolition of the old. For instance, it describes the transition from capitalism to imperialism as the increased number of workers, increased quantity of capital investment, reduced number of the owners of the means of production, and so on. It means acknowledging just the external causes of development, rejecting the internal ones. The other outlook on the development of matter is, however, based on materialist dialectics, which holds that contradiction is universal, it exists in every matter. Each contradiction has two opposite aspects. Through their struggle one prevails, defeats and eliminates the other, and in this process the old thing is eliminated and a new thing triumphs. The capitalist society has two contradictions: the external one is the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which is primarily resolved by socialist revolution. The other is internal and basic, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of ownership, which is resolved through the process of overthrowing private ownership and establishing social ownership by socialist construction. The contradictions between the superstructure and economic base and between the productive forces and relations of productions, which emerge continuously, can be continuously resolved in the socialist system.

As it is not rational to take the era of imperialism and Leninism as static and unchangeable like the heaven, so is the subjective thinking of gradual inception of new eras and ideologies in the name of creative theory of continuous motion. The meanings of the both are the same: capitalism is immortal and will not be abolished. In this way Sarker declines Lenin's proposition of imperialism as "moribund capitalism", "capitalism transition to socialism". Failure to recognise the

differentiation among change, growth and development is the basis of this conception. Growth means quantitative change while development is the manifestation of the creation of something new, i.e., basic qualitative change. Those who take growth as development cannot explain the internal causes of this change. They are also unable to explain the causes of struggle of the opposites, the process of leap, inception of the new and decline of the old.

Development should be perceived as one governed by the law of dialectical materialism. The laws of the unity and struggle of the opposites, one dividing into two, victory of one and defeat of the other in the struggle of the opposites, leap, transformation of one into the other, and abolition of one and inception of the other are to be realised. Com. Sarker proclaims that it is baseless to think that Maoism cannot emerge from Leninism if Leninism can emerge from Marxism. And in this way he is continuously telling the story of the emergence and development of new epochs and new ideologies one after another, where there is no room for the application of the laws of dialectical materialism, no room for the contradiction between capitalism and socialism as well as for the development of one and decline of the other. Com. Sarker is counselling to follow his subjective, whimsical and autocratic decision.

In our country, those, who hold that capitalism would be in motion for ever and cannot be abolished, decline the theory of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution as the new stage of the development of capitalism. In other words, it means to decline Leninism, abandon revolution setting aside the tasks of the era of revolution, i.e., to carry on the task of legal, spontaneous mass movement of the era of relatively peaceful development of capitalism instead of practicing revolutionary politics and building revolutionary struggle and revolutionary organisation. As they decline Lenin's doctrine on imperialism, they abandon revolution in the name of accomplishing "purely proletarian socialist revolution", leaving the tasks of revolution in the colonial, semi-colonial and neo-colonial countries to the bourgeoisie. Declining the Leninist theory that the onus of leadership of the democratic revolution in the era of imperialism is on the communist party, they have projected India as an independent capitalist country, ignoring the existence of feudalism and imperialism. In his book *The Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin launched intense theoretical struggle against Kautsky who was the foremost to decline the theories on imperialism in the international sphere.

Let us take the instance of pre-revolution China. In this country, Dr. Sun Yat-sen had been earnestly endeavouring to accomplish the bourgeois-democratic revolution as long as forty years, but in vain. After the accomplishment of the October Revolution Lenin met Dr. Sun Yat-sen to interpret the differences between the era of *lesser-faire* capitalism and the era of monopoly capitalism, i. e., imperialism, and between the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the previous era and the people's democratic revolution in the era of imperialism. Dr. Sun Yat-sen deeply realised these differences, and adopted the **Three People's Principles** on the basis of the alliance with the Soviet Union, co-operation with the Communist Party of China and assistance to the workers and peasants. With the realisation of the differences among the bourgeois democracy, people's democracy and the democracy of the working class he called all the people to come forward to accomplish the anti-imperialist democratic revolution in China on the basis of the **Three People's Principles**.

Citing this instance, we are likely to give emphasis on the realisation of the differences between the two eras and between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and people's democratic revolution in the era of imperialism.

Just after this Shahjahan Sarker unleashed attack on Leninism and genuine Leninists with the false accusation of interpreting Leninism, the Marxism of the era of imperialism, as "static, absolute and sacred like the heaven which can hardly undergo any change". The intention behind this accusation is to adopt Maoism in place of Mao Tse-tung Thought, rapidly branding Leninism as an "outdated ideology".

Whether the Era of Imperialism and Leninism are Static Like the 'Heaven'

Mr. Sarker, the era of imperialism and Leninism have been, as we all know, formulated and interpreted by Lenin and Stalin. After being justified through revolutionary practices, these tenets have been universally accepted. But you have been pretending to adopt the theorisation on imperialism and Leninism by Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung while trying to reject its revolutionary essences by giving wrong and distorted interpretation. Therefore, your cannon is, in fact, roaring against nobody else other than Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Now, let us judge

whether the era of imperialism and tenets of Leninism are static and unchangeable like the heaven or they are under a dynamic process.

Lenin formulated the transition of capitalism to imperialism as the highest stage of capitalist development by explaining the significance of the new features of politics conforming to the changes in economy. Developing the theories expounded by Marx and Engels, Lenin concluded that after reaching its highest stage capitalism would start to collapse, and hence he marked imperialism as the eve of the proletarian revolution. After the victory of October Revolution Lenin proclaimed the beginning of the era of proletarian revolution and collapse of imperialism, and observed that the world had been divided into two—socialism and capitalism. Opposing Trotsky's fallacy on the impossibility of building socialism in a single country, Lenin and Stalin concluded to build socialism in the Soviet Union. Stalin implemented Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP), accomplished collectivization in agriculture and unprecedented development in industry. As a result, socialism became victorious in the Soviet Union. Following Lenin's theory on imperialism, Stalin formulated the theory on both economic and political aspects of the general crisis of capitalism.

The defeat of fascism and victory of the Soviet power in the Second World War ushered in a glorious and marvelous history of the world as a whole. Analysing the concrete situation following the WWII, Stalin concluded that the capitalism had been immerged in a recurring, uninterrupted and permanent crisis. With the stagnancy of capitalist production and emergence of two world-markets instead of one, the theory of boom and slum experienced a great change. Both Lenin's observation in 1916 that "capitalism is rapidly growing in spite of decay" and Stalin's own formulation of "relative stability of market" in 1925 became obsolete in the changed situation of the WWII. He launched intense ideological struggle against the revisionism in the forms of Trotskyism and Titoism. Stalin's profound contribution to the development of revolutionary struggle in different countries as well as to the victory of Chinese Revolution is worthy of being remembered for ever.

After the WWII an anti-imperialist socialist camp was established, whereas the imperialist camp became weaker. Citing this significant aspect of the development of the world situation, at the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) held in 1952, Stalin observed, "Formerly, the bourgeoisie could afford to play the liberal, to uphold the bourgeois-democratic liberties, and thus gain popularity with the people. Now not

a trace remains of this liberalism. ...Formerly, the bourgeoisie was regarded as the head of the nation; it upheld the rights and independence of the nation and placed them "above all else". Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard."[18] Com. Mao called this speech of Stalin a "precious last testament bequeathed to the Communists of all the countries of the world". Under these circumstances, the Moscow Statement of 81 Parties in 1960 unanimously adopted an important resolution, saying, "Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale." The resolution further stated, "The chief result of these years is the rapid growth of the might and international influence of the world socialist system, the vigorous process of disintegration of the colonial system under the impact of the national-liberation movement, the intensification of class struggles in the capitalist world, and the continued decline and decay of the world capitalist system. The superiority of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war, is becoming ever more marked in the world arena.....A reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victories for socialism. The complete triumph of socialism is inevitable."[19]

In a word, *as per* the Moscow Statement, it is an epoch of struggle between the two opposing social systems, i.e., capitalism and socialism, and the transition from capitalism to socialism; and, on other hand, an epoch of the breakdown of imperialism as well as the disintegration and abolition of the colonial system.

Com. Sarker speaks just of the development of Leninism while concealing the question of continued decline and breakdown of imperialism with the disintegration and abolition of the colonial system. The more the imperialism gets disintegrated through revolutionary struggles the more is the socialism strengthened and the more Leninism develops. Can, therefore, the process of development of Leninism with

the continued breakdown of imperialism be called static and unchangeable like the heaven? Here we have just put forward how Lenin, Stalin and Mao showed the dynamic process of decline of imperialism and development of Leninism after the emergence of imperialism, whereas Sarker denounces the analysis made by our international teachers as static and unchangeable, and unleashes slanderous propaganda against the genuine Leninists. His allegations are vague, baseless and ridiculous, aren't they?

Marxism-Leninism — the Last Phase of Development of the Ideology of Social Revolution

Despite not accepting Leninism Sarker endlessly strains his brain on the development of Leninism. As Leninism is not an ever-lasting entity, how far would it be stretched, and when its development would complete? The answers of these questions must be sought. Leninism is the internationally accepted ideology of the proletariat. The answers of these questions would be found from Stalin's analysis on Leninism, the 81 Parties' Moscow Statement and the experience of building socialism in the USSR. Sarker has hardly realised Stalin's formulation of Leninism as the "Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletariat revolution". Leninism is related to the abolition of imperialism as well as to the proletarian revolution. Leninism, the ideological weapon of the proletarian for uprooting the exploiting classes from the society and achieving victory of socialism, will be relevant and valid as long as imperialism exists. Lenin said, "Classes do not exist in socialism." Following Lenin's proposition in the concrete situation of the Soviet Union, Stalin concluded in 1939, "The Soviet society no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes; the exploiting classes have been eliminated."[20] He proposed to build a "classless socialist society" and said, "Classes will be abolished through harsh class struggle." After the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union Stalin announced to build "developed socialism", and adopted the programme of continuous struggle against the bourgeois habits and bourgeois influences, i.e., the programme of cultural revolution. The Soviet Union gradually entered into the first stage of communism. Stalin, a competent successor of Lenin, managed to implement Leninism heart and soul. In essence, imperialism

and the exploiting classes had been overthrown in the domestic sphere of the USSR and other socialist countries, and thereby the Soviet society witnessed an unprecedented change in its class-relation. Stalin needed neither "Stalinism" nor "Maoism" for bringing these changes, just Leninism was enough. Regarding the post-imperialist epoch, Stalin observed, "(it has in view) another epoch, namely, the epoch after the victory of socialism on a world scale, when world imperialism no longer exists; when the exploiting classes are overthrown and national and colonial oppression is eradicated; .....is just as absurd as it would be to demand that the epoch of the domination of capitalism should not be at variance with the epoch of the domination of socialism, that socialism and capitalism should not exclude each other."[21]

The essence of this quotation is that the formation of an exploitation-free and classless social system on a world scale will usher in a new epoch, when imperialism no longer exists, and the proletarian revolution and its ideology, i.e., Leninism, are of no necessity.

Marxism-Leninism is the last stage of development of the ideology for social revolution, it will be in effect until communism is established. But Com. Sarker cannot accept this proposition. We know, communist society is classless, exploitation-free and stateless. Against whom will the class struggle and social revolution be in force in a society where there is no exploitation, no exploiting class, where classes and class contradictions on longer exist? What is the necessity of a proletarian party and Marxism-Leninism as its ideology, if classes do not exist? Of course, contradictions between man and Nature, between productive forces and relations of production and between right and wrong, and also the struggles for their resolution must remain in the communist society.

Class-Independence of Philosophy and Science —an Idealist Doctrine

The protagonists of Maoism insist, "Our ideology is a science, and, therefore, there is no relation of ideology with epoch." With the utterance of such sentence they manage to separate ideology from social science. Marx, on the other hand, brought the science of society into harmony with the materialist foundation and reconstructed it thereupon. Applying materialism on men's social life, Marx discovered the scientific method

for interpreting social knowledge with social existence instead of interpreting the existence with the 'knowledge' of pre-Marxist philosophy.

"The mode of production of material life," as Marx observed, "conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness."[22] Here Marx clearly noted that the mode of production conditioned the intellectual life process. He further observed, "Technology discloses man's mode of dealing with Nature, the immediate process of production by which he sustains his life, and thereby also lays bare the mode of formation of his social relations, and of the mental conceptions that flow from them."[23] Marx managed to give an integral formulation of the fundamental principles of materialism as applied to human society and its history in the preface to his *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.*

Wherefrom has science originated? From the need of material production. Engels said, "The origin and development of science have been determined by production itself from the very beginning." He said on the relation between science and technique, "If, as you say, technique largely depends on the state of science, science depends far more still on the *state* and the *requirements* of technique. If society has a technical need, that helps science forward more than ten universities."[24]

Social production, i.e., economy, is the base of a society. Superstructure originates therefrom. With philosophy and ideology being its components, superstructure does play a role in class struggle. Stalin observed, "...having come into being, it (superstructure) becomes an exceedingly active force, actively assisting its base to take shape and consolidate itself, and doing its utmost to help the new system to finish off and eliminate the old base and the old classes."[25] All these constitute social science as an integrated whole. Social practice achieved the status of science as a result of following the materialist laws of social development. With Marx's formulation on the origin, development and decline of the socio-economic system, history achieved the status of science. Engels said, we owe two extra-ordinary theories to Marx, one his theory of surplus value, and the other, the theory of historical materialism (the materialist conception of history). The protagonists of Maoism are virtually declining these two theories. Marx deepened and developed philosophical materialism to the full, and extended the

cognition of nature to include the cognition of human society. "Marx's historical materialism was", as Lenin said, "a great achievement in scientific thinking. The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in views on history and politics were replaced by a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory."[26]

Thanks to this scientific and extraordinary doctrine founded by Marx and Engels Marxism is called a science. But the protagonists of Maoism decline the science of society and science of history by showing no relation of ideology to epoch and claim their illusive proposition of Maoism as a science. In this way, they decline the significance of the mode of production and exchange as the Marxist doctrine of the origin of an ideology; dissent the Marxist view that mutually opposite economic interests give birth to classes, class contradiction, class antagonism and class struggle in the society; and veil the class character of Marxist ideology. In the name of class-independence, impartiality and scientism of philosophy, they are trying their best to rehabilitate the bourgeois philosophical propositions. As philosophy is created by the classes of the society in a certain epoch, the partiality of philosophy represents the interest of the particular classes. By discovering its class-character Marx and Engels brought revolution in philosophy. There is and should be no class-independent philosophy in a class-divided society. The protagonists of Maoism decline these vital theories of Marxist philosophy.

The political mentor of Sahjahan Sarker, a protagonist of Maoism, is, however, the RIM (Revolutionary Internationalist Movement). In a bilateral talk with the undivided MCC in 1997, the representative of RIM insisted, "Ideology emerges as a result of the development of science and technology, and the development of science and technology plays the determining role in social changes."

Development of science and technology does neither create an ideology as such nor bring changes in the social system. Unprecedented development of science and technology has been witnessed in the USA and the advanced capitalist-imperialist countries of Europe; but these countries can hardly usher in an advanced social system and create an advanced ideology either. Development of science and technology enriches natural sciences and determines the relationship of man with Nature, but cannot bring changes the relation of man with man, which is under the purview of social science. Association of science and technology with production promotes the development of productive

forces, leading to a surge in production. For the sake of increased production both capitalist-imperialist countries and socialist countries develop and introduce science and technology. But the aim of capitalist production is to secure maximum profit, and not to solve the problems of the people. Aim of socialist production is, on the other hand, to secure maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the people. For this reason, unlike in the capitalist countries, this contradiction can hardly assume the form of class struggle in the social arena thanks to the planned economy in the socialist country. In the capitalist country, however, the capitalist class endeavour to keep the relations of production in old conditions for the sake of profit, despite the development of productive forces and surge in production. As a result, the contradiction between new productive forces and old relations of production gets intensified, leading to severe struggle between the exploiting and exploited classes. With the creation of new relations of production conforming to the productive forces by shaking off the old ones through social revolution, society marches ahead.

Applying dialectical and historical materialism in analysing the history of human society, in addition to studying the overwhelming workers' movement in Europe in the nineteenth century, Marx and Engles scientifically revealed in the *Communist Manifesto* that **the history of all hitherto existing society was the history of class struggles.**

After being combined with the process of production the nature of science and technology changes, it enters into man's social relation, and the doctrine of class struggle arises therefrom. Science and technology help the development of production and serve the interest of that class which conducts production. The ideology of the class that conducts production exerts its influence upon science and technology. Science indeed bears the ideology in its womb. If science and technology stand in opposition to the interest of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois ideology hinders their development as well.

In opposition to the impartiality of science, Lenin said, "Throughout the civilised world the teachings of Marx evoke the utmost hostility and hatred of all bourgeois science (both official and liberal), which regards Marxism as a kind of "pernicious sect". And no other attitude is to expected, for there can be no "impartial" social science in a society based on class struggle. In one way or another, *all* official liberal science *defends* wage slavery, whereas Marxism has declared relentless war on that slavery. To expect science to be impartial in a wage-slave society is

as foolishly naive as to expect impartiality from manufacturers on the questions of whether workers' wages ought not be increased by decreasing the profits of capital."[27]

To show an inseparable relationship between philosophy and science Alexander Harzen, the Russian thinker, compared philosophy to the stalk of a large tree while sciences with their innumerable fields to its branches. If you cut off the branches, only a piece of dead log remains; and, with the removal of the stalks the branches will dry out. Science and philosophy mutually co-exist, the existence of one is hardly possible without the other's.

Marxism, the ideology of the working class, is a science. But of what science is it? "Marxism is", as Stalin observed, "the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society."[28]

Look here, after separating ideology from social science, the protagonists of Maoism now claim, "Ideology emerges as an outcome of the development of science and technology and this is what that determines the social changes." In this way, they denounce the Marxist doctrine of the emergence of ideology from the mode of production and exchange that determine the social changes. They put forward such proposition with a view to declining the class-character of ideology and giving support to the bourgeois idealistic fallacy of class-impartiality of science and technology. In their struggle for denouncing Marxism-Leninism, they are taking futile attempts to revive the propositions of idealistic world outlook, which had been buried in the past, that "science needs no philosophy" and "science is itself a philosophy". Their "creative doctrine", i.e., the doctrine of Maoism, is, therefore, neither a science nor the continuity of Marxism-Leninism, but just its reverse, i.e., bourgeois idealism. So using a '-' after Marxism-Leninism to put Maoism would be a treachery to Marxism-Leninism.

On Mao Tse-tung Thought

The RIM and its associates suggest that Mao Tse-tung Thought is a universal ideology. In his book *Maoism vs Modern Revisionism*, Com, Sarker clearly insists, "The ideological matter of Mao Tse-tung Thought is a matter of ism, no doubt." He further insisted, "The constituent Parties

of the Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM) have generalised the universality of Mao Tse-tung Thought as Maoism."

Following a resolution on Leninism adopted by the Third International in 1924, Marxism-Leninism has been universally accepted as the ideology of the working class all over the world. But now the situation is different. With the absence of any competent and internationally renowned leadership like Lenin, Stalin or Mao, the communist parties of different countries are split into many groups. Under these circumstances, an organisation like RIM made Leninism "outdated" and generalised Mao Tse-tung Thought, thereby proclaiming Maoism as the ideology of the world proletariat. Unfortunately, those who oppose this RIM's imposition are branded as anti-Maoist and Hoxaite version of revisionism. This practice is, as we feel, an expression of whimsicality and anarchism in the political and ideological field while sectarianism in the field of organisation.

The ideological matter of Mao Tse-tung Thought is, as Sarker, with the RIM being his mentor, argues, "a matter of ism, no doubt". Is it a rational thinking? Not at all, rather it is a subjective dogma like the religious faith. In order to face those who doubt instead of accepting his words "no doubt", Sarker has projected the 9th Congress of the CPC (held in 1969) as an evidence. The CPC's 9th Congress described the ideological matter of Mao Tse-tung Thought as a "matter of ism", he claims. It is, however, not the fact. The 9th Congress pronounced, "Mao Tse-tung Thought is Marxism-Leninism". But Com. Sarker paid no serious attention in his study.

By the way, in a certain time, the Soviet Union witnessed a strong propaganda for "Stalinism" in the form of a couple of words, "Lenin-Stalin". Stalin said in reply, "It is an exaggeration. To place Stalin's portrait by the side of the Great Lenin's is absurd, as giving equal importance and equal dignity of Lenin to Stalin is hardly rational." Stalin further said, "I have no disciple, rather myself is Lenin's disciple." It means that it is Leninism that has been developed, enriched and defended by Stalin.

In 1952, the CPSU (B) in its 19th Congress evaluated Stalin in this way: "Comrade Stalin's classic work, *Marxism & Problems of Linguistics*, raises to a new level the fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory concerning the law-governed character of social development, makes a thorough examination of the question of the economic basis of society and its superstructure, and of the question of the productive

forces and the relations of production. It develops further the theory of dialectical and historical materialism, as the theoretical basis of communism. ...Comrade Stalin's works on economic problems and linguistics mark a new stage in the development of Marxism and provide a superb example of the creative approach to the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin."[29] Yet, the contributions of Stalin to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism is hardly termed as Stalinism.

What is the view of the Communist Party of China on Stalinism? In their document, *More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (December 29, 1956), the CPC said, "As long as we sum up Stalin's thoughts and activities in an all-round way, then, even if people must speak of "Stalinism," this can only mean, in the first place, communism and Marxism-Leninism." Obviously, as Stalin Thought is Marxism-Leninism so also is Mao Tse-tung Thought. Both Stalin and Mao defended and enriched Marxism-Leninism, and developed it in higher phase. Mao Tse-tung Thought is, therefore, but Marxism-Leninism, and not a new ideology.

On this question Lenin observed, "Our doctrine—said Engels, referring to himself and his famous friend—is not a dogma, but a guide to action. This classical statement stresses with remarkable force and expressiveness that aspect of Marxism which is very often lost sight of. And by losing sight of it, ...we undermine its connection with the definite practical tasks of the epoch, which may change with every new turn of history. ...in recent years Russia has undergone changes so abrupt as to alter the situation with unusual rapidity and unusual force—the social and political situation, which in a most direct and immediate manner determines the conditions for action, and, hence, its aims. I am not referring, of course, to general and fundamental aims, which do not change with turns of history if the fundamental relation between classes remains unchanged. ...But the aims of immediate and direct action changed very sharply during this period, just as the actual social and political situation changed, and *consequently*, since Marxism is a living doctrine, *various* aspects of it *were bound* to become prominent."[30]

Here Lenin reveals that definite practical tasks of an epoch change with the change of that epoch, and it is this urge from which the necessity of a new doctrine is felt. Com. Sarker wants to denounce Lenin's proposition by labelling it *yugbaad* (ism of era or epoch). As doctrine or ideology is created by the epoch and classes, Lenin observed, "...general and fundamental aims ...do not change with turns of history

if the fundamental relation between classes remains unchanged." It is Lenin and Stalin who formulated the general and fundamental line of the world communist movement in the era of imperialism. So, as long as the fundamental relation between classes remains unchanged, i.e., the worldwide social system undergoes no fundamental changes, the general or fundamental line of the world communist movement, as analysed and formulated by Lenin and Stalin, would remain unchanged as well, having no possibility of emergence of a new epoch and a new ideology. It would be a serious mistake to confuse the aims of immediate and direct action with general and fundamental aims.

In continuation of Lenin's proposition, Mao said, "It was by following the teachings of Lenin and Stalin,...that the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people achieved their historic victory....."[31] Mao further asserted, "The Chinese Revolution achieved victory by applying the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete situation of China." It is clear from Mao's assertion that the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism, and not Maoism, was enough for the Chinese Revolution.

In the post-Mao China, the *Resolution on the Thirty Years' History of the Party* adopted by the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Congress of the CPC in 1981 said, "Mao began to commit serious mistakes after 1950 and to initiate the cultural revolution was the greatest blunder in his life, because there did never exist two lines and bourgeois headquarter in China. ...Struggle against the revisionism of Khrushchev was unnecessarily exaggerated. ...Labelling Russia as social imperialism was not a resolution adopted by the Party's Central Committee." Besides, Tito of Yugoslavia, a well-marked betrayer of Marxism-Leninism, was reconciled and honoured as a "great Marxist-Leninist".

It is this anti-Mao line which is being followed by Com. Sarker and the RIM, his mentor. They have hardly any struggle against Titoite and Khrushchevite forms of revisionism, rather they have also reconciled Tito as a great Marxist-Leninist. At the same time, criticism of Stalin, the great defender of Marxism-Leninism and our teacher, is the part and parcel of the doctrine of Maoism, they proclaim. So the anti-Mao line adopted by the revisionists within the CPC is now being followed by bigoted Maoists like RIM and Sarker.

With a view to projecting Mao Tse-tung Thought as a universal, i.e., ideological, entity Com. Sarker quotes from the Ninth Congress of the CPC: "Especially important is the fact that the draft Party

Constitution has clearly reaffirmed that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is the theoretical basis guiding the Party's thinking. This is a great victory for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in smashing Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line on Party building, a great victory for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought." Thereafter he interprets: "The word 'reaffirmed' has been used because the Seventh Congress of the CPC (held in 1945) adopted Mao Tse-tung Thought as the theoretical basis of the Party but, at the same time, confined it within the national sphere of China alone. ....The Eighth Congress (1956), however, hardly mentioned it. Just in that year Khrushchev dismantled the dictatorship of the proletariat and built the Party and State 'of the people', thereby degenerating them to revisionism and capitalism to create scepticism in the socialist camp. Perhaps, in such complexity, the Eighth Congress of the CPC did not want to engage itself in the quibbling on Mao Tse-tung Thought in the global sphere. ...But the Ninth Congress adopted Mao Tse-tung Thought as the theoretical basis of the Party."(pg. 38).

From this interpretation Com. Sarker has drawn the conclusion that the "universality of Mao Tse-tung Thought was an accepted matter in the CPC itself" (pgs.38-39). In the Seventh Congress, as he admits, Mao Tse-tung Thought was adopted as the theoretical basis of the CPC; but it was hardly mentioned in the Eighth Congress while, in the Ninth Congress, Mao Tse-tung Thought had a comeback. At the same time, Sarker bypassed the question whether Mao Tse-tung Thought was mentioned in the Tenth Congress of the CPC. With a view to distorting the history he puts forward self-invented interpretation and concocts story to clarify why the Eighth Congress did not mention Mao Tse-tung Thought.

Why Mao Tse-tung Thought was skipped in the CPC's Eighth Congress? In so far as our study and research are concerned, Stalin and Mao laid stress on the necessity of reorganising the Third International after the expulsion of Tito from the Cominform in 1948. Accordingly, the weapons of criticism and self-criticism were firmly introduced to wipe out the influence of the Trotskite and Titoite lines in the CPSU(B), CPC and CPI. On this occasion an Editorial was published in the organ of Cominform, *For a Lasting Peace For a Peoples Democracy*, in the year of 1950. In its Report, the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) held in 1952 raised the weapon of firm and extensive self-criticism to eliminate defects in the work of Party.

In 1950, B T Ranadive, the then General Secretary of the undivided Communist Party of India, admitted in his self-critical report that he had, under the influence of Trotskyism, deviated from Stalin and Marxist-Leninist line to make serious damage in Indian revolution. Bhowani Sen, another prominent figure in the CPI, said in his self-criticism, "From September 1948 to February 1950 the Polit Bureau was following a policy hostile to the international communist movement. The Troskyite-Titoite line had been introduced. Slanders against the Cominform were propagated through *Tanjug*, the organ of the Titoite fascists." Ranadive further admitted, "The Communist Party of China under the leadership of Com. Mao Tse-tung has successfully applied the teachings of Lenin and Stalin in the victorious struggle for liberation of the Chinese people. The experience of the victorious liberation struggle of the Chinese people will act as an infallible guidepost to the Communist Party and working class of India."

On the other hand, the editor of *Peoples Daily* published a letter on June 16, 1950, in reply to a reader to eliminate defects in the Party. As the letter mentioned, Stalin's statement that "the characteristic of the Chinese revolution is that an armed people opposes armed counter-revolution" was an extraordinarily correct formulation.

On Mao's *Problems of War & Strategy* the editor commented, "This was Comrade Mao Tse-tung's penetrating summation of the problems of war and strategy, based upon the theories of Lenin and Stalin and the experiences of the Chinese revolution."

The editor's letter dealt with a very important matter. The editor wrote, "We have received your letter in which you state that, having studied Chairman Mao Tse-tung's *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party* and having pondered over the nature of the Chinese revolution, you believe Stalin's statement that "the characteristic of the Chinese revolution is that an armed people opposes armed counter-revolution" conforms to the historical reality in China. But, you ask: "Perhaps the revolution of no one country in the world will diverge from this pattern. Why did Stalin not say that this was the characteristic of the revolution of all countries but instead describ ed it as purely the characteristic of the Chinese revolution?" In reply, the editor said, "Very obviously, this characteristic—an armed people opposing armed counter-revolution—is something which was not present in the revolutions of any capitalist country in the past. This characteristic first appeared during

the people's liberation struggle in semi-colonial and semi-feudal China. But *under certain historical conditions*, it can become the common characteristic of the people's liberation struggle in many colonial and semi-colonial countries."

Stalin's famous saying on China's armed struggle was made during an address to the Chinese Commission of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on November 30, 1926. In this address, Stalin said, "But in China, it is different. In China, it is not the unarmed people but the armed people represented by the revolutionary army, who rise up against the army of the old government. In China, armed revolution opposes armed counter-revolution. This is one of the characteristics of China's revolution. It is one of the advantages of China's revolution. Herein also lies the special significance of the revolutionary army in China."

As per Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung Thought, the editor of *Peoples Daily* gave a correct answer to the question the reader put forward. I fully agree with him. The "characteristic of the Chinese revolution" means it was not universal. But I must retort the questions Com. Sarker has thrown as a pretext of Mao Tse-tung Thought in order to install Maoism. It is clear from the editor's letter that Stalin acknowledged it as one of the characteristics of China's revolution but unconditionally rejected the claim of its being the characteristic of the revolution of all countries.

Does it mean downgrading Mao's contribution? Not at all. Neither downgrading nor upgrading bears credibility. What Stalin stated conforms to Marxism-Leninism based on dialectical and historical materialism and deserves to be defended from the campaign of metaphysical and idealistic philosophy. It is the universality of Marxism-Leninism that determined the particular characteristic of China's revolution. The characteristics of China constituted the particularity of Chinese revolution, whereas the universality of Marxism-Leninism is applicable under the context of the social system all over the world.

That it is the characteristic of China means the characteristic is a particular one, and not universal. It, as the editor wrote in his letter, "can become the common characteristic of the people's liberation struggle in many colonial and semi-colonial countries" which means the characteristic was special in the world social system despite it being a general one in respect to China. It was an outstanding example of the

dialectical relationship between special and general entities, which is general in one condition is special in other, and conversely, which is special in one condition may be general in other. Mao Tse-tung Thought is, therefore, not an universal entity and not an ideology either. On the basis of this significant resolution of 1950, the Eighth Congress of the CPC held in 1956 abstained from adopting Mao Tse-tung Thought as an ideology.

Afterwards, with the demise of Stalin in 1953, the renegade Khrushchev & co. appeared in the political stage of the Soviet Union. In China, the forces in opposition to Leninism combined to bring back Mao Tse-tung Thought as an ideology. Comrade Mao, on the other hand, raised a strong voice in favour of Leninism in the CPC's Ninth Congress with a firm assertion, "Leninism has by no means outdated even today". Besides, in the Congress, Mao delivered a significant speech which the CPC has failed to publish till date. Carefully averting all these events, Com Sarker has been loudly pleading for Maoism. At the same time, he is surprisingly keeping silence on the Tenth Congress of the CPC. Why does he not even mention the stance of the CPC's Tenth Congress on imperialism, Leninism and Mao Tse-tung Thought? The Tenth Congress asserted, "Leninism is, as Stalin defined, Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletariat revolution. This is entirely correct. Since Lenin's death, the world situation has undergone great changes. But the era has not changed. The fundamental principles of Leninism are not outdated; they remain the theoretical basis guiding our thinking today." Here Mao Tse-tung Thought, as an ideology, was further removed while the fundamental principles of Leninism were kept intact as "the theoretical basis guiding our thinking even today".

Khrushchev was the first, as we all know, to declare that Leninism had become outdated with the abolition of the colonial era. At the same time, he asserted the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism. Now the words of Khrushchev are being echoed in Sarker's voice. As a matter of fact, under the pretext of Maoism, he is trying to denounce Marxism-Leninism, dismantle the communist parties and create confusion and despondency among the revolutionary people, thereby pushing the revolutions of different countries towards catastrophe. He is hardly launching any struggle against renegades Kautsky, Trotsky, Tito, Khrushchev, Liu, Deng and other running dogs of imperialism while, in various ways, calumniating Lenin, Stalin and Mao—the pioneers of

building socialism and communism as well as the incessant guards of the anti-imperialist liberation struggles in the world.

In order to replace Leninism with Maoism the protagonists of Maoism take up the reactionary weapons of distorted and fallacious interpretation on three philosophical postulations: (i) the relation between universality and particularity of contradiction, (ii) the relation between the absoluteness and relativity of contradiction, and (iii) relation between analysis and synthesis.

Com. Sarker has spent a lot of words on universality and particularity and on absoluteness and relativity of contradiction. But does he know the context of Mao's article *On Contradiction*? He has hardly examined it. In 1930, the fallacious theories on dialectics preached by Plekhanov, Bukharin and Deborin became null and void in a seminar in the Soviet Union. The Deborin school held, "Contradiction appears in a process, not at its inception, but only at a certain stage of its development, and it happens as a result of the action of external causes." Following Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and thoroughly studying the seminar papers, Comrade Mao refuted Deborin's fallacies in his famous article *On Contradiction.* Deborin declined the existence of contradiction in a matter or process at its inception, and, in opposition to dialectics, iterated the metaphysical outlook of development as a result of the action of external causes. Mao, in this article, dealt with the universality or absoluteness and with particularity or relativity of contradiction with a view to waging struggle against subjectivism, dogmatism and one-sidedness.

Comrade Mao said, "In our analysis of the law of contradiction in things, we shall first analyse the universality of contradiction, then place special stress on analysing of its particularity, and finally return on the universality of contradiction. The universality or absoluteness of contradiction has a twofold meaning. One is that contradiction exists in the process of development of all things; and the other is that in the process of development of each thing a movement of opposites exists from beginning to end."[32]

(A) **On the universality and particularity of contradiction.** There does exist a dialectical relationship between the universality and particularity of contradiction. Universality lies in the particularity. If all particular, i.e., independent characteristics be removed, universality would cease to exist, and, conversely, particularity could hardly exist without the existence of universality; it is the universality that determines

the particularity. Motion, things, processes and thinking— all are contradiction. To deny contradiction is to deny everything. This is a universal truth for all times and all countries, which admits of no exception. Hence the general character, the absoluteness of contradiction. On the other hand, all individual character exists conditionally and temporarily as every independent characteristic partially enters in the universality. The universality of contradiction does, therefore, deserve the priority.

(B) **On the absoluteness and relativity of contradiction.** What is the outlook of the protagonists of Maoism on the absoluteness and relativity of contradiction? They repeatedly accuse Stalin of "talking only about the struggle between the opposites, and not their unity". In the same way, in 1958, Yang Hsien-chen, agent of Liu Shao-chi, the Chinese Khrushchev, with ulterior motives, advocated "using identity of contradictions" and by insinuation attacked the Party (the CPC) because it "talked only about the struggle between the opposites, but not their unity"[33] The unity between the opposites is, as we know, conditional, temporary and relative while the struggle between the opposites is absolute. Accusing Stalin in this way, the protagonists of Maoism are, like the Chinese Khrushchevites, defending the capitalist restoration, aren't they?

(C) **On analysis and synthesis.** Now, let us examine their philosophical stance on the question analysis and synthesis. With a view to installing Maoism, Prachanda, the General Sectary of the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist), wrote an article on analysis and synthesis in their Party organ *Workers* some ten years back. In that article, what he interpreted on analysis and synthesis to resolve contradiction by applying the theory of unity between the opposites, i.e., "combine two into one" was a reactionary proposition. Is it not the manifestation of defending the line put forward by the Khrushchevites of China? Despite of being the founder of dialectics, Hegel showed the resolution of contradiction through combining two into one at the final stage of its development, which virtually runs in opposition to his own dialectical theory. Bukharin did also talk of conciliation of contradictions through "combine two into one". All these are the reactionary doctrine of abandoning class struggle.

In the CPC, Yang Hsien-chen alleged, that "analysis means 'one divides into two' while synthesis means 'combine two into one'." It is, therefore, to be known first what the Marxian interpretations of analysis

and synthesis are. The CPC asserted, "Analysis shows how an entity divides into two different parts and how they are locked in struggle; synthesis shows how, through the struggle between the two opposite aspects, one prevails, defeats and eliminates the other, how an old contradiction is resolved and a new one emerges, and how an old thing is eliminated and a new one triumphs. In plain words, synthesis means one "eats up" the other. The course of historical development is: What is revolutionary always "eats up" what is reactionary, and what is correct always "eats up" what is wrong." Mao pointed out, Classes struggle, some classes triumph, others are eliminated. Such is history, such is the history of civilization for thousands of years. To interpret history from this viewpoint is historical materialism; standing in opposition to this viewpoint is historical idealism."[34]

Analysis and synthesis are closely connected. There is synthesis in analysis and analysis in synthesis. As Engels said in reference to the science of chemistry: "Chemistry, in which *analysis* is the predominant form of investigation, is nothing without its opposite pole—*synthesis*."[35]

In order to establish Maoism Shahjhan Sarker and his associates have distorted the dialectical relation between the universality and particularity and between the absoluteness and relativity of contradiction, and also between analysis and synthesis, in addition to distorting the dialectical relation between the identity and struggle of the aspects of contradiction. It is not the matter of ignorance on Marxism-Leninism, but the intention behind it is to adopt Maoism by deceiving those whose realisation on Marxist philosophy is not so sound. For instance, regarding the dialectical relation between the universality and particularity of contradiction, they show that the universality of contradiction exists in its particularity and, therefore, no general characteristic can exist without particularity, i.e., independent characteristic. It is correct, no doubt. But, at the same time, is it not the general characteristic, i.e., universality of contradiction, that determines its particularity? They have, however, ignored such an important proposition, thereby giving particularity (instead of universality) and bourgeois nationalism (instead of proletarian internationalism) the top priority. Similarly, they stress on unity and abandon struggle by giving priority to the relativity (instead of absoluteness) of contradiction.

The essence of their argument is that analysis means "one divides into two" while "combine two into one" is the meaning of synthesis. From this metaphysical angle of view Deborin perceived no contradiction

in the beginning of a process or matter while the protagonists of Maoism defend Deborin's metaphysical philosophy instead of dialectics by showing the way of resolving contradiction through "combine two into one". Comrade Mao, the great leader of Chinese Revolution, launched an intense ideological struggle against those who imported these reactionary philosophical doctrine in the CPC. Today, in the name of creative development of Marxist-Leninist ideology, the protagonists of Maoism have labelled "purity" on this reactionary philosophy to hawk in the market.

We are now putting forward the tragic sequel of all these conspiracies.

The Third Communist International was, as we know, disintegrated in 1943, i.e, during the Second World War. The member Parties felt that the guardianship of the International was no longer necessary as the Communist Parties of different countries had become matured. But, interestingly, many of those who declined the necessity of the existence of the CI, formed the Fourth International later on under the leadership of Tarik Ali, although it was nipped in the bud. An organisation like the RIM (Revolutionary Internationalist Movement) is going to share the same fate (i.e., that of the Fourth International), however.

Com. Sarker claimed, "The onus of establishing Maoism is not, by any means, bestowed on the present revisionist Party of China. To establish Maoism is the onus of the international Maoist proletarian revolutionaries. In the nineties of the last century, the member-Parties of the RIM Committee generalised the universality of Mao Tse-tung Thought as 'Maoism' on the basis of an unanimous resolution." "The Maoists of India have", he continued, "adopted the formulation of Maoism by a broad inner-Party struggle."[36] But as we know, Com. Ganapati, General Secretary of the CPI (Maoist), claimed in a recent statement, "The RIM is but a moribund organisation". We feel, Com Ganapati's observation is, hundred percent correct and acceptable, as it reflects the reality. Side by side, we feel the necessity of combating the campaign the RIM has already unleashed on the dialectical and historical materialism.

It is an urgent need to think deeply of the purpose of Maoism, the "creative ideology" propagated by the protagonists of Maoism like the RIM and Shahjahan Sarker. We know, Marxism-Leninism is a comprehensive, harmonious and integral ideology of the proletariat. But, in order to denounce and dismantle this scientific ideology, they are

creating anarchy by importing innumerable doctrines like "Maoism", "Ganjalo Thought", "Prachanda Path", and so on.

The Communist and Workers Parties are guided by the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. With the concrete analysis of the concrete situation, they creatively apply these principles in revolution of their own countries, and maintain a coordination with the international duty of their own nation to adopt the strategy and tactics of the revolution. In every country, there are general characteristics in the revolutionary experiences and scientific thinking as well as the particular characteristics related to the historical situation and tradition of the country. Regarding the dialectical relation between the general and particular characteristics, all our great teachers, i.e., Lenin, Stalin and Mao, have placed the general rules and international duties at the first and foremost position. But, in showing the dialectical relation between the general an particular characteristics, Com. Sarker does just the opposite, i.e., he places the national duties and national characteristics at the foremost position, and overestimates the national characteristics to give priority to bourgeois nationalism. In this way, the protagonists of Maoism recognise innumerable varieties of Marxism, i.e., pluralism, as there are differences in the national characteristics among the countries, which splits the Communist Parties, driving the revolution to catastrophe and resulting in strengthening the hands of reactionary forces and imperialism.

On the CPC and Maoism

We would not like to enter into an extensive discussion here on the CPC. To establish their doctrine the protagonists of Maoism put forward a distorted interpretation of the CPC's statement, and highlight the voice of the anti-Mao revisionist headquarter as Mao's voice. In the two-line struggle in the CPC, we are to defend the Mao line and denounce the other.

With this objective, we now proceed from the May 16, 1967 Document on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. As the Document asserts, "Marx and Engels founded the theory of scientific socialism. Lenin and Stalin developed Marxism, solved various questions related to the proletarian revolution in the era of imperialism, also solved the theoretical and practical problems of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has developed

Marxism, solved the questions of proletarian revolution in the present time, and also solved the theoretical and practical problems of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and frustrating the endeavour of restoring capitalism. These three stages resemble three great and profound milestones in the history of development of Marxism."[37] The Document asserted that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao— all had developed Marxism. But the Third Communist International resolved Marxism-Leninism as the ideology of the world proletariat. Then why Leninism has not been mentioned here? Is it not a design for declining the Resolution of the Third International? Certainly it is. What had been talked about Lenin and Stalin in the Document was, however, essentially the formulation of Leninism and nothing else. This tactics was adopted with the purpose of declining Leninism, wasn't it? We all know that Mao was always in defence of Leninism while the representatives of the revisionist headquarter and successors of Khrushchev and Liu Sao-chi in China were in its opposition. No sooner had Sarker and the RIM showed Leninism "outdated" to formulate Maoism than their revisionist character was exposed.

Why did the Document state that Lenin and Stalin "solved various questions related to the proletarian revolution in the era of imperialism" while, regarding Mao, it announced that he (Mao) "solved the questions of proletarian revolution in the present time"? The question of new era was averted in the Document by using the words "in the present time" in order to face those who had brought the doctrine of "new era" in place of the "era of imperialism", isn't it? But Comrade Mao solved the questions of proletarian revolution of which era? Mao himself answered this question, when he said, "We are still in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution." It is, therefore, clear that those who claim new ideology in the new era in place of Leninism and the era of imperialism represent the headquarter of the anti-Mao Chinese revisionism.

Now, let us once more recall the arguments Sarker put forward. He insinuated by writing "*yugbaad bonum dwandwabaad*" (ism of epoch vs dialectics), "*yugbaadi samrajyabaad*" (epochist imperialism), "*yugbaadi leninbaad*" (epochist Leninism), and so on. From these insinuations it is crystal clear that he is in trouble on the question of era or epoch, and can refute it neither by devising dubious theories nor by giving distorted and fallacious interpretation.

If we deal the question of Sarker's stance on Leninism, we can see that he accuses of declining the emergence of new era and new ideology from the same era. It is a false accusation. Had the accusation been true, we would not recognise the emergence of the era of imperialism and new ideology, i.e., Leninism, from the era of capitalism. This theorisation abides by some laws which Sarker declines, and instead put forward another argument whether the era of imperialism and era of Leninism are static like the heaven. From all his arguments is it not exposed that he wants to mean Leninism has become outdated? But we know, as Lenin observed, general and fundamental aims do not change with turns of history if the fundamental relation between classes remains unchanged.

Look here, how much similarities there are between the arguments of the anti-Mao revisionists in China and those of the RIM and Shajahan Sarker. It is, therefore, rational enough to mark them anti-Mao Maoists, isn't it? Adoption of Maoism is a hypocrisy, their intention is to reject Leninism. We know, Mao Tse-tung Thought had been adopted as the guiding ideology of the CPC in its Seventh Congress. In 1950, however, it was resolved to be the characteristic of China and not the whole world. The CPC did not keep intact Mao Tse-tung Thought in its Eighth Congress held in 1956 in accordance to this resolution. The Moscow Declaration of 1957, the 81 Parties' Moscow Statement of 1960 and the CPC's June 14 Letter of 1963 (which upheld the general line of the International Communist Movement) projected Marxism-Leninism without mentioning even a trace of Mao Tse-tung Thought. Had Mao Tse-tung Thought been universal the CPC would raise the question at the International forums which were the proper places for dealing with the matter. But the CPC did not, because it knew well that it was a domestic matter of China, and not universal and, therefore, not international in character. But when Khrushchev, the betrayer, declared that the colonial era had terminated and Leninism had become outdated, the Khrushchevites in the CPC resorted to criticism and slander against Stalin, in one hand, and rejecting Leninism, i.e., the path of armed revolution, adopted the doctrine of peaceful transition to socialism, on the other. Thenceforth the followers of Chinese Khrushchev (in Mao's words) loudly claimed Mao Tse-tung Thought as an ideology, i.e., Maoism. And, as Stalin was the Lenin in the post-Lenin ages and an earnest defender of armed revolution in different countries, they, in order to denounce him, formulated: "Criticism against Stalin constitutes an

essential component of Maoism". Now judge who these elements are. Obviously, these elements are the successors of Khrushchev and Chinese Khrushchev, who usually shout the slogan of Maoism and project huge pictures of Mao with a view to deceiving the working class and revolutionary people. But, as all genuine Marxists in the world know, Mao carried on hard struggle throughout his life for the sake of advancing the continuation of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin and sweeping away the revisionist refuse in the form of Maoism. Even that we can carry on this debate today is the outcome of getting inspired for revolution by the great Mao's works and the Mao line in the CPC's documents.

To veil their revisionist face Shahjahan Sarker insists that the onus of establishing Maoism was not on the present revisionist Party of China, but on the Maoist revolutionaries of the world— it was a collective decision of the constituent members of the Committee of RIM. They feel that Mao himself was a revisionist while they are the Maoist revolutionaries, don't they? We all know that Comrade Mao was an earnest follower and defender of Leninism and he was in opposition to the Chinese Khrushchev. So, keeping tune with Comrade Mao, we raise the slogans: **"Long live Leninism. Down with revisionism."**

Marxism-Leninism versus Maoism

Today the capitalist-imperialist system is immersed in a deep crisis. An immediate way out is hardly possible. Recently, the working class and the working people of the capitalist countries joined in a movement with the slogans: "Seize the Wall Street, Smash the Capitalism." "They are One, We are Ninety nine." This movement bears significance, once more reflecting the reality of forming a bridge between the anti-imperialist struggles of the East and the West.

History has developed in accordance to the objective and scientific analysis of the post-WWII world situation our great teacher Stalin left behind.

There is no socialist country in the world today. Yet the imperialist powers are not in a comfortable position. We know there had been no socialist country existing in the world when the Great October (November) Revolution became victorious. The Soviet Socialism achieved victory after smashing capitalism to survive for a long time in a country, and thereby built "developed socialism" to enter into the first phase of communism. Socialism emerged and developed by the doctrine

of Marxism-Leninism, the philosophical basis of which is dialectical and historical materialism. If this doctrine survives, socialism must grow from the ashes. Out of this apprehension, imperialism unleashes vehement campaign to smash these theories and the struggles emerging therefrom; stages sabotage from within to dismantle the communist parties of different countries and tries its best to hinder the formation of genuine Marxist-Leninist parties.

To achieve this goal the imperialist agents endeavour to make the revolutionary essence of dialectical and historical materialism null and void. For this they utilise the old right revisionism and left opportunism. Keeping pace with the changing situation, they have changed their tactics. In the name of highlighting the teachings of great Chinese Revolution and the contributions of Mao Tse-tung, they have invented the anti-Mao theories of Maoism, aspiring to face or smash the scientific tenets of Marxism-Leninism with this blunt weapon.

We are thankful to Shajahan Sarker, the trusty follower of RIM, for the publication of his book *Maobaad bonam Aadhunik Somsodhonbaad* (Maoism versus Modern Revisionism, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2012), because he himself has exposed his philosophical and political hypocracy in this book.

Perhaps Sarker was never a member of any communist party, and hence he bears no liability to Marxism-Leninism and the working class. There is no reflection of his liability to the Third Communist International founded and led by Lenin and Stalin as well as no trace of his loyalty to Comrade Mao's Great Debate documents, e.g., 'The June 14 Letter', 'Khrushchev, the Hawker of Neo-colonialism', etc., found in his book. Giving up Leninism and abstaining from the tasks of the era of proletarian revolution, the right revisionists are grasping the Khrushchevite doctrine of peaceful transition to socialism. They publicly exhibit their opposition or antagonism with the imperialism, but essentially there is no antagonism, rather they have been converted to the forces of opposition to the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles; and, in this way, they are following the path of Gandhism. The left opportunists are, on the other hand, projecting themselves as the "struggling force" but lay importance just on the form of struggle and not on its content. If you raise the question how much the revolution gets strengthened and how much the imperialism becomes weakened, you would be instantly marked as "revisionist" and "anti-Maoist". Branding Leninism as "outdated", they,

in fact, replace it with Maoism. Both the right and left opportunists have, in different ways, taken Leninism as their common target. "Criticism against Stalin is", as claimed by the RIM and its defenders, "an essential component of Maoism." Virtually, there is not, and could not be, any Maoism barring criticism against Stalin.

"Khrshchev's journey to revisionism begins", as Comrade Mao observed, "with the calumny against Stalin."[38] Regarding the intention behind the calumny against Stalin, the Great Debate document commented, "The revisionism of the Marxist-Leninist theories on imperialist war and peace, proletariat revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies, the proletarian party, etc., is inseparably connected with the complete negation of Stalin."[39] To defend Stalin does, therefore, mean to defend and protect all these Marxist-Leninist theories and expose the revisionist and reactionary intention behind the calumnies against the great Stalin.

On Stalin's theoretical contributions Mao said in *The Greatest Friendship,* "All of Com. Stalin's writings are immortal documents of Marxism His works, The Foundation of Leninism, *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik),* and his last great work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, constitute an encyclopedia of Marxism-Leninism, a great synthesis of the experience of the world communist movement of the past hundred years."[40] With a deep confidence on the CPSU Mao further further said, "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a party nurtured personally by Lenin and Stalin; it is the most advanced, the most experienced and the most theoretically cultivated party in the world. The Chinese Communist Party is a party built and developed on the model of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."[41]

The CPSU(B) was, according to Mao, the most advanced and theoretically most matured party in the world. Evaluating Stalin in its Report to the Nineteenth Congress that party pointed out, "Comrade Stalin's classic work *Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics* raises to a new and higher level the fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory concerning the law-governed character of social development, and makes a thorough examination of the question of the economic basis of the society and its superstructure, and of the question of the productive forces and the relations of production. It develops further the theory of dialectical and historical materialism, as the theoretical basis of

communism. ....Comrade Stalin's works on economic problems and linguistics mark a new stage in the development of Marxism and provide a superb example of the creative approach to the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin."[42]

The real motive behind the anti-Stalin propaganda is to dismantle the communist parties in different countries, pushing revolution into a blind alley. There was a conspiracy being hatched to sever the friendship between China and the Soviet Union, thereby inflicting a catastrophe on the Chinese Revolution. To combat this conspiracy Comrade Mao wrote in a letter in commemoration to the Sixtieth Birth Anniversary of Stalin, "Stalin is the true friend of the cause of liberation of the Chinese people. No attempt, from whatever quarter, to show dissention, no lies and calumnies, can affect the Chinese people's whole-hearted love and respect for Stalin and our genuine friendship for the Soviet Union."[43]

The protagonists of Maoism like Shahjahan Sarker have adopted Maoism under the pretext of highlighting Mao but are declining Mao's observations by various means. The essence of Mao's quotations are as follows:

(a) "Khrushchev's journey to revisionism begins with the calumny against Stalin."

(b) "The revisionism of the Marxist-Leninist theories ...is inseparably connected with the complete negation of Stalin."

(c) Stalin's theoretical contributions constitute an "encyclopedia of Marxism-Leninism" and "a great synthesis of the experience of the world communist movement of the past hundred years."

(d) "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the most advanced, the most experienced and the most theoretically cultivated party in the world."

(e) "The fate of all humanity was bound up with the victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the victory in the anti-Fascist war."

The RIM and the people like Shahjahan Sarker are constantly declining these propositions of Mao but shouting "Maoism, Maoism" in the name of adopting creative theory for ideological upliftment. They follow Maoism but not Mao, whereas we follow Mao but not Maoism. Hence, we mark them anti-Mao Maoists.

They insist, "There can be no Marxism-Leninism without criticizing Stalin and defending Maoism." We, on the other hand, assert, "Without

criticising Stalin and defending Maoism there can be no modern revisionism; and, conversely, there is no Marxism-Leninism without firmly defending Stalin and opposing Maoism."

The audacity of these protagonists of Maoism knows no bound. The RIM and its followers hardly accept Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung as the international leadership while they exhibit themselves as the "leaders of world revolution". Mongering the empty phrases of new ideology, i.e., Maoism, they are, in fact, trying their best to bring the bourgeois idealist philosophy of the pre-Marx era back on the track to deceive the working class.

We know, the organiser of the RIM Committee was the RPC, USA, i.e., the Revolutionary Communist Party of the United States of America. Many of the people in the USA do not know this Party, even have not heard its name. What have they done for revolution in their own land? How is the mass base of this organisation? There are no positive answers of these questions so far available, and know news of their movement has been noticed, either. What are the conditions of the member-Parties of the RIM? In so far as our knowledge concerns, most of them have no such organisations in their own countries that can identify them as the Communist Parties. In fact, some individuals associated themselves to form an organisation which was labelled the 'Communist Party', and such kinds of parties have been given the membership of RIM. The Revolutionary Internationalist Movement is virtually such type of association.

In 1984, the RIM adopted Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung Thought as their guiding ideology. Definitely, the Marxist ideology is the ideology of the proletariat of the whole world. It, therefore, bears the international character. Ideology, as we know, is the heart of all party tasks. If there is any error on the question of ideology, it must be reflected everywhere in the works of the party, and thereby the bourgeois and counter-revolutionary interests, instead of the interests of the working class and revolution, will be served. So, how honest the aspiration might be, if the erroneous decision in respect of ideology is once taken, its movement can be hardly resisted, rather it will rapidly lead to the way of revisionism.

There is a process of and a perspective for the formation of the Communist International. There must be the maturity of the concrete situation. The ideological struggle against the opportunists of the Second

International, especially Kautsky, launched by Lenin and the victory of the great Russian Revolution led by Lenin created the basis of trust and confidence of the communists and revolutionary people of the world on him. The cannon-roar of the Russian Revolution inspired the communists and revolutionaries of the world. They accepted the great Lenin as their international leader. Under these circumstances, Lenin and Stalin took the initiative for the formation of communist parties in different countries and also for the building of Third International.

Marxism had to face the opposition from its very inception, as all exploitative social systems in the past had defended exploitation and suppressed those who stood in its opposition. Marx proclaimed the communist principle of building a new and exclusively profound society which would be classless, stateless and free of exploitation. Marxism took the oath of launching uncompromising struggle against exploitation, i.e., wage-slavery, in the society developed on the basis of class struggle. It is, therefore, a self-deception to seek anything else other than repression from the exploiting classes who unleash it to defend exploitation. Hence, history teaches that class struggle is but the motive force for the development of all societies.

Leninism is the proletarian ideology of the stage of imperialism, the special and last stage of the development of capitalism. If we lack an exclusive and deep realisation on it, it will be difficult for us to understand how much damage the doctrine of Maoism can inflict on revolution. Throughout the time, Marxism-Leninism has to develop by facing onslaughts by the reactionary, reformist, revisionist and 'left' opportunist forces. Under the influence of the propaganda against Marxism-Leninism by the bourgeoisie and their associates, revisionists and opportunists, the socialist camp has experienced unreliability, incredulity and vacillation on ideology, depression and disintegration, resulting in the formation of several communist and socialist parties and groups in different countries. The anti-imperialist and democratic camp is now under the condition of disorder. Today all genuine Marxist-Leninists and all those who believe in materialism should realise: campaign is being unleashed against dialectical and historical materialism, the philosophical basis of Marxism, from totally an opposite angle of view. If we fail to unite and carry on intense struggle in order to defend the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism, our existence and identity as the communist and socialist parties will be abolished in the long run.

As an immediate task to face this situation, the rank and file of the party should learn to differentiate between materialism and idealism, between dialectics and metaphysics, and between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism of various hues. To elevate the level of realisation on these questions the leading comrades should have a deep and thorough study of the works of our great teachers, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mo Tse-tung, and learn to apply these theories in practice.

We should by no means forget that our great teacher Lenin observed, "Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement." Stalin asserted, "Not to have a correct political point of view is like having no soul." And Com. Mao concluded, "The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." Certainly, if one's line is incorrect, one's downfall is inevitable.

We must remember that only to know the theories of Marxism-Leninism is not enough, attention should also be paid to the theories around which three Great Debates centred in the process of development of Marxism. We should not rely on the oral speeches alone, rather investigation and research must be carried on for getting access to the truth. Then and then only we can deeply realize the theories of Marxism-Leninism. Through twists and turns we would be able to develop our confidence on these theories and correctly handle the debates.

In this context, an example may be cited. In 1934, after visiting Roosevelt, the then President of the USA, H G Wells, the world famous writer, economist and journalist, came in Moscow to meet Stalin. In an interview with Stalin, Wells said, "In Washington I was struck by the same thing I see going on here." Wells further said, "It seems to me that what is taking place in the United States is a profound reorganisation, the creation of planned, that is, socialist, economy. You and Roosevelt begin from two different starting points. But is there not a relation in ideas, a kinship of ideas, between Moscow and Washington?" "It seems to me", he continued, "that instead of stressing the antagonism between the two worlds, we should, in the present circumstances, strive to establish a common tongue for all the constructive forces."[44]

We have cited this example because it would enable us to read the measure the capitalist world had taken by that time to overcome the crisis, i.e., the Great Depression. On the other hand, from it we can, to some extent, understand how the big leaders of the socialist camp assisted the capitalists, how the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union

and China, degraded to capitalism, and which path, socialist or capitalist, the protagonists of Maoism have taken in the current debate.

The creation of planned, i.e., socialist economy, was, as Wells asserted, taking place in the United States. Stalin, however, remarked that it was impossible to create planned economy without getting rid of the capitalists, without abolishing the principle of private property in the means of production. In fact, the capitalists of the USA were, in this way, trying to minimise the excesses of crisis to some extent, and Roosevelt's planned economy would, by no means, give birth to socialism. At the best, it would promote the development of state monopoly capitalism.

Stalin and Roosevelt, as Wells stressed, "begin from two different starting points. But is there not a relation in ideas, a kinship of ideas, between Moscow and Washington?" Roosevelt started from the point of defending the capitalist exploitation and private ownership, whereas Stalin's starting point was the abolition of exploitation and private ownership. Two goals were, in fact, mutually opposite. Ridiculously, Wells showed a kinship of ideas between two mutually opposite social systems—capitalism and socialism. In other words, Wells tried to show the way of resolution of contradiction between these two hostile social systems by abandoning antagonism and replacing class struggle with class collaboration *as per* the reactionary metaphysical doctrine of "combine two into one". In the Soviet Union, Bukharin had put forward the theory of reconciliation of contradiction by abandoning antagonism and conflict with the kulaks, who were the part of exploiting class, and incorporating them into the rank of peasantry. He had virtually imported the theory of "growing capitalism in socialism" by combining the capitalist and socialist systems.

With the assertion "instead of stressing the antagonism between the two worlds, we should, in the present circumstances, strive to establish a common tongue for all the constructive forces", Wells advised to abandon antagonism/contradiction between the two worlds. But, we know, *as per* the law of "unity of the opposites", struggle between the two opposite aspects is primary and absolute while their unity is secondary and relative. Gladly accepting this anti-dialectical and metaphysical proposition of Wells, several theoreticians of the Marxist camp are denouncing Stalin by saying "Stalin talked only about the struggle of the opposite aspects but not about their unity".

In order to save capitalism some famous western economists of that time, including H G Wells, proposed a notorious theory, the theory of convergence, for establishing unity between socialism and capitalism. If this theory be implemented, what should be the character of the new system? Some insisted that the new society would be socialist, some other stress it to be capitalist while some other still predicted it to be neither socialist nor capitalist, rather it would be of a revised capitalism.

And, with the adoption of the theory of growing capitalism in the womb of socialism as a result of the amalgamation of these two systems, Tito, Khrushchev and Liu Sao-chi took the road of capitalism, thereby leading to the growth of capitalism within socialism. With socialism gradually becoming weaker and capitalism "eating up" socialism in the long run, the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union and China, were degraded to capitalism. As Tito adopted the theory of unity, i.e, amalgamation, instead of struggle, of these two opposite social system, Stalin launched ideological struggle against him and ultimately expelled him from the Cominform. In the Soviet Union, Bukharin had pleaded for this theory, against which Stalin launched a serious debate, and thereby defeated Bukharin. Afterwards, Bukharin was expelled from the Party in accusation of indulging in destructive activities against socialism. In China, Liu Sao-chi adopted this theory to meet the need of capitalist restoration. Similarly, Liu Sao-chi was expelled from the Party thanks to the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution initiated by Comrade Mao against the capitalist roaders. Hence, Mao pointed out, "Revisionism is the main danger today."

One thing is crystal-clear here that Stalin had showed how much damage would be inflicted and how terrible sequel would be ushered in by an erroneous proposition. Stalin refuted the points raised by Wells with his profound arguments and wisdom.

Some Comrades stress only on the economic and political struggles, but neglect the work of enriching themselves for judging theory, denouncing it as an "act of petty-bourgeois prattling on theory". It is a wrong notion. Theoretical struggle is by no means less important than the practical one. If we neglect it, all our labour and self-sacrifice would produce no effective result. Building a politically and ideologically monolithic Marxist-Leninist Party is but a work of hard and intense labour.

The Party must have its own education system. Those who teach must have enough experiences on both theory and practice. Once the correct political and ideological line of the Party is determined, its success or failure would depend on the Party cadres. "If we succeeded in making the cadres quite mature Marxist-Leninists capable of solving the problems involved in the guidance of the country without serious error", as Stalin pointed out, "we would have every reason to consider nine-tenths of our problems already settled. And we certainly can accomplish this, for we have all the means and opportunities for doing so."[45] In order to lead the current debate to the road of success we have to hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism by advancing the continuation of our International leaders — Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

References

1. Karl Marx & Frederick Engels, Selected Works, Eng. edn., Vol. I, Moscow, 1946, pg. 336.
2. J V Stalin, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, 1938, National Book Agency Pvt. Ltd. Calcutta, 1972, pg.17.
3. Ibid, pgs. 17-18.
4. V I Lenin, Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, Selected Works, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pg.45.
5. Ibid, pgs. 45-46.
6. Frederick Engels, Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, pgs. 133-134.
7. J V Stalin, Anarchism or Socialism, Works, Vol. I, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, pg. 322.
8. J V Stalin, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, pg.19.
9. J V Stalin, *op cit*, pg. 1.
10. Frederick Engels, *op cit*, pg. 130.
11. Karl Marx, Afterward to the Second German Edition of Capital, Vol. I, 1938, pg. 30.
12. Frederick Engels, *op cit*, pgs. 130-131.
13. Karl Marx, Selected Works, Eng. edn., Vol. I, Moscow, 1946, pg. 300.
14. J V Stalin, Anarchism or Socialism, Works, Vol. I, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, pg. 306.
15. V I Lenin, Materialism & Enpirio-Criticism, 1908, FLPH, Moscow, pgs.33-34.

16. Mao Tse-tung, On Contradiction, Selected Works Vol. I, Foreign Language Press, Peaking, 1965, pg.325.
17. Ibid, pg.325.
18. J V Stalin, Speech at the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), October 14, 1952.
19. Statement of 81 Communist and Workers Parties Meeting in Moscow, USSR, 1960. New York: New Century Publishers, 1961.
20. J V Stalin, Political Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), March 10, 1939.
21. J V Stalin, Marxism and Problems of Linguistics, Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1976, pgs. 51-52.
22. Karl Marx, Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Selected Works of Marx & Engels, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969, pg. 503.
23. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Chapter XV, Sec. X, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1954 (reproduced from First English Edition of 1887), pg. 330.
24. Frederick Engels, Letter to W Borgius in Breslau (H Starkenburg was wrongly identified as the addressee in all previous editions), January 25, 1894, Selected Works of Marx & Engels, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, pg. 502.
25. J V Stalin, *op cit,* pg. 5.
26. V I Lenin, The Three Sources & Three Component Parts of Marxism, Selected Works, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pg. 45.
27. Ibid, pg. 44.
28. J V Stalin, *op cit,* pgs. 52-53.
29. G Malenkov, Report to the Nineteenth Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B), October 5, 1952, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, pgs. 88-89.
30. V I Lenin, Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism, Collected Works, Vol. XVII, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, pg. 39.
31. Mao Tse-tung, The Greatest Friendship, People's Daily, March 9, 1953.
32. Mao Tse-tung, On Contradiction, Selected Works, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1975, pg.316.
33. Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front (1949-64), FLP, Peaking, 1976, pg. 49.
34. Mao Tse-tung, Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle (August 14, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV, FLP, Peking, 1975, pg. 428.
35. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Publishers, Moscow,1976, pg 293..
36. Shahjahan Sarker, Maobad Bonum Aadhunik Samsodhanbad (Maoism Versus Modern Revisionism, Utsa Publishers,Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2012, pgs. 39-40.

37. The Editorial of People's Daily and Red Flag on a Historic Document (the 16 May Circular of 1966) of the CPC, May 16, 1967.
38. Mao Tse-tung, quoted in the Editorials of Red Flag and People's Daily, September 13, 1963.
39. On the Question of Stalin, The Editorials of Red Flag and People's Daily, September 13, 1963.
40. Mao Tse-tung, The Greatest Friendship, People's Daily, March 9, 1953.
41. Ibid.
42. G Malenkov, Report to the Nineteenth Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B), October 5, 1952, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, pgs. 88-89.
43. Mao Tse-tung, Stalin — Friend of the Chinese People (December 20, 1939), Selected Works, Vol. II, FLP, Peking, 1975, pg.336.
44. J V Stalin, Marxism versus Liberalism, (An Interview with H J Wells, July 23, 1934), Bolshevik, No.17, 1934.
45. J V Stalin, Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), March 10, 1939, Works, Vol.XIV, Red Star Press Ltd., London, 1978.